

CONCERNING THE HOLY SPIRIT

CONTENTS

	<i>pages</i>
THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE SCRIPTURES <i>Rev. Father Richard Kehoe, O.P.</i>	2
ON SOME IMPLICATIONS OF THE "EX PATRE FILIOQUE TANQUAM AB UNO PRINCIPIO" <i>Rev. Father Paul Henry, S.J.</i>	16
THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE ORTHODOX TRIADOLGY — <i>Professor Vladimir Lossky</i>	31
THE HOLY SPIRIT IN CHRISTIAN INITIATION <i>Rev. Father L. S. Thornton, C.R.</i>	53
THE HOLY GHOST AND THE MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST <i>Dom Clement Lialine</i>	69
APPENDIX — — — — —	94
ON THE MEANING AND IMPORTANCE OF CONFIRMATION <i>Père L. Bouyer, of the Oratory</i>	95

SINGLE COPIES 2s.

London Agents : Geo E. J. Coldwell, Ltd., 17 Red Lion Square,
Holborn, London, W.C.1, to whom all subscriptions
are to be paid, except those from U.S.A.

U.S.A. Agents : The Secretary, Catholic Near East Welfare
Association, 480 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N.Y.

THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

The Price will be 2/- per issue.

Annual Subscriptions 8/- per year post free.

America and Canada Subscription 2\$ (two Dollars).

London Agents:

GEO. E. J. COLDWELL, LTD.,
17 RED LION SQUARE,
LONDON, W.C.1

Telephone: CHAncery 7483

U.S.A. Agents:

THE SECRETARY, C.N.E.W.A.,
480 LEXINGTON AVENUE,
NEW YORK 17, N.Y.

I. THE SUPPLEMENTARY ISSUE on TRADITION AND SCRIPTURE

2/- each copy can be had from the above agents

THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

VOL. VII No. 2

1948

SUPPLEMENTARY ISSUE

LAST year has proved that the bringing out of a Supplementary Issue is the best way of publishing the Oxford papers. Herein, then, are the papers read at the E.C.Q. Conference at Blackfriars, Oxford in the October of 1947.

It will be seen that many of the titles given to the papers are differently worded from what appeared on the programme. This greater precision in the titles is the doing of the readers of the papers themselves.

A certain amount of discussion, which was good, that was aroused by the speakers has been referred to in some of the papers, e.g. in that of Father Henry. To this issue, as last year, there is also an appendix. We had thought that Father Thornton's paper would have called forth a discussion on the subject of Confirmation, a question at present being very deeply considered by the Anglicans, it did not to any great extent. The subject, however, demands consideration and has obviously its proper place in a publication of papers *Concerning the Holy Spirit*.

THE EDITOR

THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY CONFERENCE

BLACKFRIARS, 3RD—5TH October 1947

General Chairman : REV. FATHER MARK BROCKLEHURST, O.P.

- | | |
|------------|---|
| Oct. 3rd | The Holy Spirit in the Scriptures. By Father Richard Kehoe, O.P. |
| 8 p.m. | |
| Oct. 4th | On Some Implications of the "Ex Patre Filioque Tanquam ab Uno Principio." By Rev. Father Paul Henry, S.J. |
| 2.30 p.m. | |
| 8 p.m. | The Procession of the Holy Spirit in the Orthodox Triadology. By Professor Vladimir Lossky. (Orthodox.) |
| Oct. 5th | The Holy Spirit in Christian Initiation. By Rev. Father L. S. Thornton, C.R. (Anglican). |
| 11.30 a.m. | |
| 2.30 p.m. | The Holy Ghost and the Mystical Body of of Christ. By Dom Clement Lialine. |

The Holy Spirit in the Scriptures

THE Hebrew Scriptural term for Spirit, namely *Ruach*, and also the Greek term, *Pneuma*, both originally mean breath or wind, especially breath that is violently exhaled, or a strong driving wind. They come then to mean life, whether the source or principle of life, or some one or other of its manifestations; but life understood, not simply as the natural phenomenon of life, but as a mystery, that is to say, as a participation in the ultimate Life that is divine. So that finally it is the absolute life of God that is the essential meaning of Spirit. God *is* Spirit; a creature cannot be Spirit, but can only receive of its effects. A creature *is* Flesh. For the chief meaning of this word Flesh, in the Scriptures, is not that of the body as against the soul, but of the substance or nature of the creature as such. "The Egyptians are man, and not God, and their horses flesh, and not spirit" (Is. xxxi, 3). And again: "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man and maketh flesh his arm" (Jer. xvii, 5). The pathetic characteristic of Flesh

is that, as such, it is mortal; and the glory of Spirit, that it is, as such, immortal life (for example, cf. Is. xl; Ps. ciii, 15).

God *is* Spirit; man can never *be* Spirit. Nevertheless man can be brought into relationship with Spirit: indeed it is not long before it is realized that he only exists at all because of a creational relationship to Spirit. The question, then, arises and becomes the central issue of the drama of the Scriptures, in what sense, or to what degree or what depth Flesh can come to participate in Spirit: that is to say, whether and in what sense man can become like God! The issue is only resolved in the New Testament; but in the Old, its implications are tremendously unfolded and the way prepared.

Considerable light can be gathered on what is at issue by considering a pair of words—in the Hebrew, *Nephesh*, and in the Greek, *Psyche*—which stand in contrast to *Ruach* and *Pneuma*, the words for Spirit. As with them, the original meaning is that of breath or wind, but when *Nephesh* and *Psyche* come to denote life, if they are strictly used it is the natural life of the creature that they denote, the intrinsic form of life that makes it to be simply its living self (cf. Gen. ii, 7). Of themselves they say nothing of a transcendent relationship to the absolute life of God. This restricted meaning of *Nephesh* appears in its affinity to the idea of blood. *Nephesh* and blood can in fact be equated. "The life (*Nephesh*) of the flesh is in the blood" (Lev. xvii, 11). This is wonderfully suggestive already of what one knows to be the final way, in fact the only way, by which Spirit and Flesh can be married. The way is that of true Sacrifice, which means the shedding of blood, or in other words, the losing of the *Nephesh* or the *Psyche*—in order that the life of the Spirit may be attained to. The Spirit can spiritualize the Flesh only if the Flesh will die, only if body and Blood or body and *Nephesh* (or *Psyche*) are allowed to be parted. He that would save his life must lose it. For body and *Nephesh* (or *Psyche*) to cling together, refusing to open to the irruption of Spirit—that is the very meaning of sin. And that is why sin can be described as Fleshly or Carnal—since it means that the Flesh will not die and allow Spirit to enter, Spirit to be born; or can also, by St. Paul, be described as being Psychic—since it means a morbid clinging to the *Psyche* (or the *Nephesh*). The Holy Spirit will only be given as the result of a process that is one of a separation or of a dying first effected within the order of Nature, only be given in the strength of a new birth, and not in any sheer extension

or enlargement or exuberance of natural life; just as the world attained to its full created state only through a process that tore it from its undividedness and set it over against itself in the division of light and darkness, sea and land, male and female—out of which relationship the Cosmos was built up, or was born. One must not anticipate unduly; yet it is perhaps desirable at this point to indicate what the drift of the argument of this paper is intended to be.

It was in fact only very gradually that the conception of a possible transforming of Flesh by Spirit was arrived at. According to the earliest conception represented in the Scriptures, Spirit is a force that operates as though automatically, without anything of immediate moral significance; so as to suggest comparison with the *Mana* of the savages. It was a terrible alien force that could invade the realm of nature and could take possession of a man, but not so as to effect a new order of life, not so as to spiritualize. It would turn a man into "another" man, take him out of himself, but not so that he might then return to himself as a new man. It worked upon him transiently (the Spirit had not yet come to Rest); it left him and his real self was unchanged. It brought about a state of possession, but did not lead on to that possession—or inspiration—that springs from, or is one with, a deeper self-possession. A man was carried out of himself; not, however, to return upon himself bringing inspiration back into his ordinary life until it too should be transformed. Although the power of the Spirit may be at work, therefore, in such an experience, the gift of the Holy Spirit, the third Person of the Blessed Trinity, is not conferred: there is not the fullness of Creation, a "likeness" is not realized to that fullness of life in God which means that from the Source of the godhead that is the Father, the Son or the Word is born; and from the mutual love of Father and Word, the Holy Spirit has sprung. Or equally one may say that the "likeness" is wanting to the Incarnational gift of the Spirit, where it is through Christ's (the incarnate Word's) response to the Father's will, and return upon his own life as it represented the Father's will, that Spiritual life is born and the Spirit poured forth.

This early conception of Spirit and the corresponding crude forms of spiritual experience are represented, for example, in the Book of Judges (iii, 10; vi, 34; xi, 29; xiii, 25; xiv, 6, 19; xv, 14, etc.) To be a "man of the Spirit" it was sufficient to be a leader or a warrior endowed

with abnormal courage or enterprise; or to be possessed of divinatory power; or even to be a gigantic bully or buffoon. Or to be mad or to be a wild fanatic would at this early stage be a quite sufficient qualification. Whatever departed from the normal so as to suggest the irruption of forces from the other world would be regarded as a manifestation of the Spirit. The Spiritual was simply the miraculous, and anything abnormal suggested the miraculous.

But the most significant example of this crude acceptance of Spirit is provided by the early form and institution of prophetism (cf. Is. x, 6, 10; xi, 6; I Kings xviii, 29, etc.). The prophet was *par excellence* the "man of the Spirit." Yet all that was necessary to authenticate one of these early prophets was that he should be capable of being carried away in an ecstasy of religious enthusiasm or excitement. It was not required that he should proclaim any Word of God. There is no need here to consider what foreign influences were probably at work in Israel at this period to encourage these tendencies—for example the almost certain influence exerted by the Syrian practice of a dervish-like prophetism. But it is most necessary to recognize how universally representative these tendencies are, and what the typical significance is of this cult of ecstatic prophecy. For it expresses, in a splendid though primitive way (at least when studied within the context of the whole biblical history) that whole impulse and movement and moment of life that can be conveniently termed Erotic, to which Pantheism is the religious equivalent.

If this kind of ecstasism should become established as the goal of life, as an end in itself, it would be something morbid. But if it is ready to be transcended, then it represents the first movement of the Spirit, leading to that culminating movement in which the Holy Spirit, the Third Person, is given. Before that culmination can be achieved, the mystery of the Word of God must be enacted. This first rush and outpouring of life must be thrown back into relation to the source or ground of life from which it was escaping. If it must die—as Eros seeks always in some way to die—it must die back into the soil of life. Such a death, the true Sacrificial death, will prove fruitful, will prove to have fertilized the soil of Nature so that it bears the fruit of the Holy Spirit. The erotic movement, then that makes for abandonment, for ecstasy, for an immediate absorption into the absolute goodness it envisages, must be turned back to find issue *via* the acceptance of what is finite and narrow

and seemingly contradictory of all that it longs for. This is the way to its being reborn as Love or Charity, as that divine love that is poured forth in our Hearts through the Holy Spirit that is "given" to us (Rom. v, 5).

It is in obedience, then, to the Word of God—to that power of the Word that the Crucifixion embodies—that Eros must be sacrificed, in order that it may rise again, not as Desire, but as that fulfilment of Desire which is the Love of Communion with God. The Spirit of God that provokes, that is as a storm or a fire or a torrent, yields to that Holy Spirit of God that is gentleness and peace, marking the fulfilment of creation, the full assimilating, or "likening" of the creature to the mystery of the life of the Blessed Trinity.

It is the sign and sacrament of the Cross that must seal down that first outpouring of life, creating a new deep source, out of which when the life springs again it will be as that fountain that wells up unto eternal life, as that love that abides (cf. John iv, 14; Gen. xxix, 1-10; Matt. xxvii, 60-6; xxviii, 2, etc.). It is not with this culmination of the mystery that we are at the moment concerned; and yet it is impossible to grasp the drift of the Old Testament except in the light of its fulfilment in Christ.

The coming of the great prophets marks a tremendous advance towards a true conception of Spirit. There is now interplay of Spirit and Word. The great prophets are both "men of the Spirit" and "men of the word." They were inspired to conceive and to deliver God's Word. And the Word of God was a revelation of the redemptive, creative power of God at work in the stuff of nature, of human life, of history; Faith meaning the living response to this truth, the humble obedience to this truth. This was the only way to Communion with God, the only way by which the full outpouring of the Spirit could be attained. It was by a return upon life, by a Conversion—and not by any straining ahead, as it were, or through any simple ecstatic or erotic pursuit of the goal of his longing that man could attain to real blessedness, and to that fullness of Inspiration which would consist in the quickening of his real deepest self until the holy Spirit child should be born of him.

Yet the prophets saw most clearly that the first ecstatic impulse and the erotic craving of life must not be killed, cannot

be killed, but must be sacrificed and so realized in a deeper way than they literally suggested; that they already denoted the action of God, of the Spirit—if only they were not clung to according to their literal, their worldly, their carnal sense, but were allowed to break through to the life that of themselves they only blindly sought, by being given their full scope, by being allowed to die and to rise again as Spiritual life attained, possessed, “enjoyed.” Then only would the Holy Spirit have been “given.”

So these great prophets taught that it was only a Remnant in Israel that would be saved: which means that Israel could be saved only by dying and being reborn. It is only this Spiritual child of Israel upon whom, or in whom, the Holy Spirit of God could be as though at Rest. Only if life should rise again out of death, if Israel could be born again, would that fountain have been opened “to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Israel” (Zach. xiii, 1) which would mean the Holy Spirit given to them, poured forth on, or in their very Flesh; which would mean the full realization of the Messianic promise (cf. Joel, ii, 28; Is. xlv 8, Acts ii, 17, etc.).

Or in other words this would mean the realization of the New Covenant that was prophesied: of that Covenant that was to be written in the Heart. For that Holy Spirit should not yet be “given” means that holy life does not yet spring from that potential deepest source and centre in man’s being which the Scriptures represent as the Heart, the Belly, the Womb, or the Rock-centre. When life should have flowed back to spring again from that centre, to be born out of that womb, this would mean the fulfilment of man’s whole being, his full unfolding and flowering, in the Likeness of God. Once again, this would mean the “gift” of the Holy Spirit, of the Personal Holy Spirit of God.

But it might be well to consider the classic text of Jeremias (xxxi, 31). “Behold the days shall come, saith the Lord, and I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Juda . . . This shall be the covenant that I will make . . . I will give my law in their bowels and I will write it in their heart: and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying: Know the Lord. For all shall know me from the least of them even to the greatest . . .” The “law” of God, written in the “heart,” is the principle of the Word of God that

stamps the natural life with a death-seal, brings it back to a nothing of self—to that mystic centre—until life then springs again in the love of God, and the new creature, being fully formed now in God's likeness, or in other words the Spirit of adoption being poured forth in his heart, responds to God with all his being (enjoys now Communion with God) and instinctively cries Abba, Father. All his being now reflects or mirrors God, he possesses God "inwardly" or "in the Spirit," no longer reaching out of himself, away from himself, as it were, snatching at divine life (cf. Phil. ii, 6). He is blessed in the fruit of his own "womb."

At the Last Supper when this promised Covenant was realized ("This is the New Covenant in my Blood"), Christ, the incarnate Word of God, took hold of his own life, with all its natural longings and its shrinking from death, and pressed upon it the stamp of the will of the Father, sealed it down under God's will; and it was through this Sacrifice, from the centre thus attained of death to self, from the Heart so pierced, that the resurrected life, the accomplished Spiritual life of Communion with God could spring (cf. John vii, 38, 39; xix, 34, 35).

With the prophecy of Jeremias one may compare that of Ezech. xi, 19 (or xxxvi, 26): "And I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of their flesh and will give them a heart of flesh: that they may walk in my commandments and keep my judgments and do them: and they shall be my people and I will be their God." The hardness of heart of which the prophet speaks could be described as a closing of the womb that prevented life from turning back and being reborn in the Spirit. And again in this prophecy it is indicated that Communion with God ("they shall be my people and I will be their God") is precisely attained at the term of the creative process, with the gift of the Holy Spirit.

The orderly procedure now would be to try to show how this mystery of the gift of the Holy Spirit was further unfolded or came still nearer to being realized in the course of the Old Testament, or else how it failed to be unfolded and in a sense was finally obstructed. One would then treat, for example, of the idea of the Virgin-Motherhood of Israel, and of the Messiah as the child of the Spirit; or as the Messiah as the Suffering Servant upon whom the Spirit rested, or as the new shoot springing up again when the axe had been laid to the root of the tree; or of Israel as the Holy Remnant;

of the exile as an experience that could have proved a Baptism for Israel, a way of a holy dying and rising in the Spirit; or of the Law as ceasing to be an effective expression of the Word of God, as no longer binding only in order to loose—that is to say, to release Spiritual life—but so as to constrict and stifle the Spirit. But instead of this, which presents too vast a programme, perhaps one may be allowed to concentrate on that idea of Creation that has underlain most of what has already been said above; to try to suggest how comprehensive is its imagery and how closely interlocked with the other great systems of imagery, but especially how richly and basically important it is in the Scriptural revelation of the meaning of the Holy Spirit.

It was the development of the idea of Creation—one might say—that led to the understanding that Flesh might participate in the Spirit, that nature might be transformed by the power of the Spirit and become intrinsically Spiritual. As the Spirit came to be recognized more and more clearly as the source of all life (for example, cf. Pss. civ, 25; cxxxix, 7; Job xxxiii, 4; xxxiv, 14), and not merely of what was extraordinary or miraculous, it would no longer seem that in the encounter of nature and Spirit, nature could only be consumed, or at least its own activity suspended. To receive of the Spirit, to be Inspired, could mean that nature—or the Flesh—was more deeply plunged in the source of its own natural being, and that a man in becoming Spiritual became more truly himself.

If for this purpose nature must first die to itself, it was by a dying back upon its own source that might be seen to be a step inherent in the process of Creation, and not some moral requirement extrinsic to it, superadded to it. Redemption could be seen as the reintegration into the Creational process, the releasing in the creature of the full creative might of God which sin has prevented. Sin is a grieving of the Holy Spirit! for in the high biblical conception of Creation (which of course is not the conception of the metaphysician and needs to be most delicately translated if it is to be restated in terms of metaphysical theology) it is one whole process that would make a man to be a man and also to be Spiritual. Sin cuts across this one whole process and causes a man to be monstrously half-created, to be a Beast. Creation in its

fullness includes a moment at which nature dies to itself and rises again, at which the first movement of life flows back upon its source and rises again. So that if one closely studies the Creational imagery one finds that it virtually includes the notions of sacrifice, of death, of rebirth or resurrection that go to constitute the terminology of redemption.

The Spirit of God moves over the Chaos, over the flood of Waters stirred up by the raging Wind. The wild Wind and Water are provoked by the Spirit of God, are in fact expressive of the divine Spirit that is active in the world, and in the heart of man, first as a violent force, that must have full outlet if the Holy Spirit of Rest, the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity, is to be "given." This is a holy Chaos. If it denotes that movement of life that may be termed Eros or Desire, but not yet Love or Agape; it denotes it in its full play, as it reaches to God himself, flings itself upon God and is ready to be transformed, to die creatively and allow itself to be reborn. The sinful Eros would lose itself, would die, but not creatively, not that holy death according to God's will that leads to resurrection. It does not really reach to the point of death to self: it is furtively engaged in saving its own life. But in this creative Chaos there is a virtue of death that is that of the Passion. It represents the fullness of the Passionate life. For in that surrender to God, readiness to take on his will, which can so easily appear as a holy loss of life, crushing down of life, there is really present a tremendous surge of life, an illimitable flood of life: nothing creaturely, nothing merely human, nothing of poor self-wilfulness, is being allowed to constrict the man's life—it is flowing freely to nothing short of God. For sin does not mean the overabundance of the energy of life, but such a stamp or form impressed on life that the full flood of it is not released; and therefore underneath the surface there is a storm of frustrated energy, of futile Desire. But the Chaos of Genesis marks the release of this energy and this Desire; presupposes that the Dragon in the deep has been killed, the evil spirit exorcised.

Nevertheless this holy Desire, this throwing of the self upon God, is not yet Communion with God. Of itself it does not go beyond a sort of Pantheistic union with him. There is an absorption in God, and there is a mingling of Flesh with Spirit. God is not met in his "otherness," and the creature is not constituted a Spiritual being resembling God in his "otherness." It is at this point therefore that

a separation, a throwing apart, a differentiation is demanded ; which means the sacrifice of Eros. The holy Eros accepts such a death, such a constructive death to self ; flows on into that true death ; and is not set on maintaining the first phase of ecstasy. It allows itself to be thrown back from God (*noli me tangere* !) and concurrently to be thrown into a dividedness within itself, a fruitful relationship within itself, in which the Spiritual and the natural are separated so that they may marry and the new child of the Spirit be born. It is that newborn child that will enjoy Communion with God. There are two processes, therefore, that go forward concurrently : the creature's being divided within itself and married within itself ; and its being thus marked off from God—set up in its own Spiritual being—and at the same time related to God in the relationship of Communion. The attainment of this Communion with God is the outcome of the whole creative work, is the realization of the mystery of the Imago and of the Temple and of the Gift of the Spirit. "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth . . . I saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband" (Apoc. xxi).

"And God said, Let there be light . . . and he divided the light from the darkness. And he called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And there was evening and there was morning, one day . . . And he divided the waters that were under the firmament from those that were above the firmament . . . And God said, Let the waters that are under the heaven be gathered together into one place, and let the dry land appear." The division of the waters into those above and those beneath the firmament, and likewise the division of light from darkness—as such, would seem to signify the marking off of the creaturely order from the divine. And on the other hand, the division of day from night and also the separation of land and sea would then signify the immanent division and marriage effected within the creaturely order, bringing about the interplay of the forces of nature and of grace that generates the child of the Spirit, the new creature that is fashioned in the likeness of God, with whom therefore it holds Communion. The first wild surrender of life to God caused nature to be plunged in, steeped in, Spirit. Now as the creature falls back again (as it were) into itself, into its own life, it is with such a fruitful interplay in itself of the Spiritual and the natural,

that it is not in fact being separated from God—it is in process of being inwardly fashioned to his likeness : it is being brought into a state of being in Communion with God.

So, for example, sea and land are separated, whereas they had been mingled together. But now that the sea is established as the sea and the land as the land, they are fruitfully related. The waters now spring up from beneath as rivers and fountains to nourish the soil, and the earth bears fruit—symbolic of the Fruit of the Holy Spirit. Or the water as such which now leaps up as in a joyous fountain of life from the heart of the earth, from the belly, from the rock, or flows as a gracious stream or river, represents—in its contrast to the first wild flood of overwhelming water—the gift of the Holy Ghost.

And similarly with the creation of day and night : they are formed over against each other, but also married together, and out of their meeting (“ and there came evening ”) a day-spring, a new day, is continually being born : more and more of Communion is realized with that transcendent Light that is God himself, until the final Glory of the creature is reached, the perfect Temple of God is built.

So through this continual division, effected by the Word of God (“ And God said . . . And God said . . . ”), into day and night, sea and land, sky and earth, male and female, the chaotic undifferentiated mass of the world is thrown into a fruitful order and relationship, out of which the Cosmos is born ; which means that the world is now made like to God, that there is Communion with God, that the Spirit is given.

Yet what is so far told in Genesis does not represent the fullness of man's creation. It remains for these mysteries to be accepted and assimilated by him. The Fall tells of the failure of man so to act, once he is fully conscious and self-governing, that he continues to be “ created ” by God ; so to act that his activity should also be an utter receptivity to the creative power of God. This receptivity implies that he should continue to live in accordance with the creational law of dying and rising, dying and being reborn ; of being torn apart in order that a fruitful Spiritual marriage may be arrived at. The Fall tells of the failure to accept the Sacrifice that this implies. The division, the sacrifice, the holy marriage that should be accomplished are clearly represented in the

paradisal imagery. The garden must be tended: the seed must be allowed to fall into the earth and die, in order that Spiritual fruit may continue to grow; there must be a Wisdom, a true Wisdom, practised, which knows how to die in order to find life; a marriage must be entered upon in order that Eros should find creative fulfilment and a holy child of the Spirit be born.

But man rejected this way of sacrifice, this way to further Communion with God; denied that it was necessary for the seal of the Will of God, for the power of the Word, to be pressed down on the flood of his Desire, being seduced to believe that Eros could find its fulfilment without having to die, without being transformed. And so the Desire in him was in fact stifled or frustrated, being shaped or directed by man's own limited idea. It is not, therefore, that Chaos has now come again! On the contrary what should have been a creative urge of life, a new Desire let loose that should have reached again to nothing short of God, and so found its fulfilment in being transformed into new love of God, a new degree of Communion with God, has been allowed to be strangled. Or in other words the holy chaos needed to be re-enacted, but was avoided.

And so it becomes clear why the redemptive, creative power of God should be revealed in the Scriptures as being first a violent action of the Spirit, a tremendous wind, a raging flood of the Spirit—bringing back Chaos. What this brings is not merely punishment for sin, merely a breaking down of the constructions of man's pride; but such a breaking down of these false, futile constructions, as should allow the flood of life to be released. It is a purifying storm to drive out evil spirit, to cause life to flow again to God, to un-loose the forces of nature, to render it Virginal, to rescue Eros. In this storm of life the Holy Spirit is not yet "given," but only in the peace that follows. Yet without this storm there can be no peace that is not a false peace (cf. Zach. i, 7 ff; vi, 1-9). There must first be a violent freeing of life from all proud or worldly forms that would constrict it. There must be the Passion before there can be the Resurrection. This release of life may seem to the sufferer more like death—for it does denote death of his former inadequate life and hopes. But when realized to be what it really is, a sheer abandonment to God, it begets a tremendous exhilaration, like that, for example, of Pentecost.

Therefore with the coming of the Lord the sea is stirred

up, the flood let loose, the winds unleashed, the foundations of the world laid bare (cf. II Sam. xxii, 9, 16; Is. li, 15; Job xxvi, 12 ff, etc.). The storm, the flood, is under the creative control of God, who "sitteth over the flood and abideth king for ever" (Ps. xxix, 10; cf. Pss. xciii, xcv, xcvi, xcvi, etc.). Given this generous release of life, the holy sealing will follow: the generosity implies the reaching to the point at which a holy dying is accepted. And so presently the new, the risen life, flows gently as a river that makes glad the City of God (cf. Ps. xxix; Is. viii, 6; Apoc. xxii, 1, etc.).

At the first Christian Pentecost, the power that is let loose is the creative power of God, and for the first time the world is to be carried to the fullness of creation. Such a tremendous drive of life as was never released until the Passion of Christ, is expressed in the mighty wind that fills this whole house—and is ready to fill the whole world. Since the Passion of Christ has been assimilated by the disciples, this tremendous life is released within them: it is the power of the Spirit driving within them. It is the holy Chaos let loose; one may say that it is Eros in full spate! And they are filled with a sense of the tremendous life flooding in them; they are carried away in ecstasy. And yet the "gift" of the Holy Spirit, the Third Person, is not represented by that Passionate ecstasy; that "gift" is only attained in the life of Love, of Agape. But this is the moment of the purification of nature, of its breaking loose from all the constricting effects of sin, of pride. It is the "moment" of Spiritual conception, not of birth. But then in the holy life that is born out of nature so liberated and so plunged in Spirit—in the fruitful Christian life of Charity that succeeds, ecstasy is not lost, Eros is not killed. Eros is realized and there is the ecstasy of the whole self made like to God and reflecting him in all its being: there is the ecstasy that is Incarnational, that is effected by the gifts of the Holy Ghost, who has come to rest in the whole human creature. The first "moment" is transitional, and is apt to be expressed in charismatic gifts that are only transient. St. Paul tells us of the "gift" that is abiding, of the "gift" that denotes that the Spirit has come to rest in us. "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not Charity . . . Charity never falleth away . . . There remain Faith, Hope and Charity, these three: but the greatest of these is Charity."

There remains, then, also Hope! For the Holy Spirit is not perfectly "given" until the whole of natural life should

have given birth in the Spirit. Until then, the coming to Rest of the Holy Spirit is only relative and provisional. The work of the Incarnation was not finished until Christ rose again from the dead—until, that is to say, that last and seemingly most unpromising material of human life which is death itself, had been rendered fruitful (cf. Acts ii, 24). Then only was he fully Glorified, then only was the Spirit fully “given” (cf. John vii, 39). So it is that in a Christian life—if it is not to become stagnant—a holy Restlessness will keep breaking out, and must not be stifled. (The Chaos will be continually brought back, and must be accepted.) Hope, which is the play of Eros within a holy life, will accompany Charity, and will strain ahead, and be overtaken, and again strain ahead: until the goal is reached. “The Spirit and the bride say: Come!”

But in so far as Charity has once been attained, the Gift of the Holy Spirit received, there is always in the meantime a Communion with God, though the love of Desire strains ahead towards the deepening of this Communion. This Communion with God—to repeat now, for the last time—is that union with God that is effected, not by snatching at happiness, not by being wrapt out of oneself, but by being constituted in oneself a true creature of God; by being made like to God—Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

The world must be united to God through coming to share in his life, by reflecting the life of the Blessed Trinity. Between God and the creature there is an infinite distance that can never be crossed. Yet it is not an infinite space that terrifies, because where the creature is, if he is a fully fashioned creature of God, he has Communion with God: he is of God, he is “in” God, he possesses him with all his being. He has union with God “*in the Spirit.*”

It is such a union with God that Christ maintained in his life and that he gives to us as his supreme gift—as one, namely, with his gift to us of the Holy Spirit. It is a union of true Love; and it is the bond of man with his fellow-creature as well as with God. It is the bond with which man must be united to Christ. We are not absorbed in Christ, but related to him in and through a wholeness of life that we achieve through him. We are united to him “in the Spirit.” Throughout his life he asserted such a relation-

ship to us. With his mother, to begin with, he practised what seemed like a stern detachment, but was really a way of loving union with her, not merely as son is related to mother, but as one whole being can be related to another in and through its very wholeness, its very fullness. And with his disciples likewise, and notably with Mary Magdalene, it was this same relationship that he asserted. They were to learn to know him in the Spirit. And therefore, if one now turned to the New Testament to follow out the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, it would be with the mystery of the Mystical Body that one would at once be concerned. By "Body" is denoted a oneness, and an organic oneness; but by "Mystical" is denoted a Spiritual oneness, such a oneness or unity as is achieved, not by welding parts into a whole (not by any sort of totalitarian aggregation), but through the working and the communication of the Holy Spirit that makes the many to be one in the strength of their individual wholeness, of the fullness of Creation that is realized in them all. So the Holy Spirit is described as the Soul of the Body of the Church. And St. Paul can pray that "The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the imparting of the Holy Spirit" may be with us all.

RICHARD KEHOE, O.P.

On Some Implications of the "Ex Patre Filioque Tanquam Ab Uno Principio"

THESE are many implications of the *Filioque tanquam ab uno principio*. Some of them are directly concerned with our knowledge of the Holy Trinity; others are wider in their application and bear on general questions of Christian conduct and on general problems in theology. I propose to consider some of these implications, dividing them roughly into two categories according as they result from, first, an "objective," and secondly, a "reflexive" approach to the subject. In the first, the content of the doctrine expressed in the phrase is chiefly considered and the implications are of moment for the Life and Faith of all Christians. In the second, it is the

formulation of the doctrine and the questions this raises that are the main object of attention—questions, for instance, concerned with the relations between Revelation and theology and between theology and different metaphysical systems. The implications here will mainly be of interest to those who are concerned with theology as a science with its own proper aims and methods. Hence while some of the considerations that follow may be too simple for theologians, others may be too technical for non-specialists. But it must be remembered that the division adopted is not an absolute dichotomy and that there are important connexions between the two aspects under which the subject is treated.

I

By way of introduction it will be useful to recall the essential points of the doctrine of the Church as it was stated in the two General Councils of Union, the Council of Lyons, 1274, which few Greeks attended and where no discussion took place, and the Council of Florence, 1439, which more than seven hundred Greeks attended and where full opportunity for exchange of views was given and taken. Some of these points are ignored by many Catholics, and perhaps by others; they are sometimes passed over in silence by professional theologians and, if not by text-books, at least by official syllabuses for papers and examinations (I can give two instances of this, one from England and the other from France). This is particularly true of the first point to be mentioned.

(a) Both Councils, Lyons and Florence, solemnly defined (the former under balanced and parallel anathemas) not only that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father *and the Son* alike, but that in this procession Father and Son are *not* two distinct principles but only *one principle*, and that there is only one spiration of the Holy Spirit. Consequently there is in the Godhead only one original and originating source of being, one *principium* (primum) as say the Latins, one (first) cause or αἰτία, as say the Greeks.

(b) The assumption throughout is that the Second and Third Persons are characterized by their (passive) *processions*, a concept which involves exclusively and strictly the note of "origin," without connotation either of inferiority or succession. It is expressly stated that the processions are eternal and that the proceeding Persons are equal to their Principle. Now in worlds and words essentially limited and temporal,

this pure origin, conveyed by perhaps the most metaphysical and certainly the most subtle terms of human language—prepositions¹ (ἐκ in Greek, *ab* in Latin²)—is very hard for us to realize and express. Some approach to this subtle notion is provided by two comparisons which are, I think, particularly relevant. The first is taken from the “legal” relation between father and son. When the son is fully grown, when he comes of age and is a perfect man, *sui juris*, he is legally not inferior to the father, although he continues to owe his being a man, to owe his being, to his father. Origin without inferiority. The second example is participation in the same knowledge by master and disciple. With regard, let us say, to the quantity and quality of his knowledge, the perfect disciple of a perfect master—supposing such persons to exist—may be conceived as knowing as much and having as deep an insight into things as the man who originally taught him not only the elements but also the finer points of any particular field of human knowledge. At a given moment the science of the disciple is equal to the science of the master, and in a way is independent of any temporal succession, although it is and remains derived from and dependent upon the science of the master.

(c) Procession, whether generation or spiration, involves a *relation* between principle and term. *Ab* or ἐκ τινος is also *ad* or πρὸς τί. This can hardly be denied. It is quite evident of Father and Son, as was observed years before the Arian controversy by Denys of Alexandria (quoted by Athanasius, *De Sent. Dion.*, 17, P.G. 25, 504C). You cannot think of the Son as such without thinking of the Father; and reciprocally, how could the Father be Father without being Father to a Son, without some internal and constitutive *esse ad alium*? This relation is clearly one of origin. The matter is not quite as clear and simple in the case of the Holy Spirit, who is described in Holy Scripture as the Spirit of the Father and of the Son, and whose relation to these Persons might be one of belonging to, having, possessing. It is quite normal that we should not be able to think out the

¹ Aristotle, as is well known, described all his “causes” in terms of prepositions.

² One of the technical difficulties between Greeks and Latins is that the Greeks consider ἐκ to connote only the First Principle, *principium sine principio*, whereas the Latins use *ab*, and would like to use ἐκ, also of the *principium de principio*. Likewise αἰτία for the Greeks would be ἀρχὴ ἀρχὴν οὐκ ἔχουσα, whereas *principium* has not got such a definite meaning.

doctrine of the Spirit in so consequential a way or express it with as much competence as we can the doctrine of the Son—for there is, in the finite world, only one instance of a procession of a nature from a similar nature, namely generation, precisely the relation between the Father and the Son, vastly different of course, but still analogous.

In God, Processions, Relations and Persons are really one. The δύναμις is the στάσις or πῶς ἔχον (or mode of being) and that is the ὑπόστασις. In man it is otherwise: you can consider him first as *being* a man, then as *active* or generating, and thirdly as having a permanent *relation* to the term of his activity, even after he has ceased generating that term. But in God, Person, Processional activity and “subsequent” relation are one and the same, inseparable and identical.

That there are relations, and those of origin, in the Godhead, belongs, I think, to the deposit of Faith and Revelation, at least in so far as they immediately arise from and are really identical with the Processions in God. On the other hand, it is not defined and does not evidently belong to the deposit of Faith that the Relations constitute and characterize the Persons, and even less, although it is most certain and true, that in God there is no distinction between the Persons except that which is involved in the complementary “opposition” of the relations. “*Omnia sunt unum ubi non obviat relationis oppositio*” is not part of the definition of the Council of Florence, although it is essential to its systematic exposition of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity—essential rather as the keystone than as the corner stone. Therefore it is of very great importance, not only for theological thought, but also (as we shall see) for spiritual life.

(d) The Council of Florence gives only one main argument for the *Filioque*; and for the *tanquam ab uno principio* only a comparison. But both complementary points are simply a corollary of the principle just recalled: in God everything is one except where “opposite” relations intervene. If the Spirit did not proceed from the Son (or the Son from the Spirit, which nobody holds or can hold), there could be no distinction between Spirit and Son. If the active spiration was as much the personal characteristic of the Father as

The English word “opposition” is not a felicitous translation of the Latin “*oppositio*.” At the meeting “contrast, contrasted” was suggested but did not meet with general approval. We mean “mutual relations” “facing one another,” but so very far from excluding one another that the one cannot exist or be thought of without the other.

fatherhood, how would the Son, as proceeding from the Father, be Son rather than Holy Spirit? The same principle proves the *tanquam ab uno principio*: the only "relational opposition" here is between active spiration and passive spiration, not between spiration and either fatherhood or filiation. As there is here no "opposition," there is no distinction, and Father and Son are together but one active principle of spiration; the opposite and complementary relation of passive spiration gives the required "opposition" and constitutes the distinct Person of the Holy Spirit.

The argument for the *Filioque* given by the Council is quite in keeping with this metaphysical principle, and moreover has the advantage of having an explicit scriptural background. It runs as follows. All that the Father has or is and does, he gives to the Son, except his fatherhood (it is easy to recognize the Johannine setting of this major premise); otherwise he would not be a perfect Father and the Son would not be his perfect image or reflexion. Now the Father produces or breathes the Spirit (both verbs are inadequate). Therefore the Father also gives to the Son his active spiration of the Spirit. If it be said that the Father's personal characteristic is to be the *principium* or αἰτία of the Son, we should, first, agree that He is alone the *primum principium* of Son and Holy Ghost, and that active spiration like divinity or any other attribute is in the Son *filiali modo*, that is, derived from the Father; and, secondly, we should not forget that in breathing the Holy Spirit, Father and Son are but one single principle. Active spiration and fatherhood are no more distinct and opposed than are filiation and active spiration.

The comparison for the *tanquam ab uno principio* says that "as Father, Son and Holy Spirit are one principle of creation (because unopposed one to another in works *ad extra*), so Father and Son are one principle of the Holy Spirit." It is taken from St. Augustine. It should not be forgotten, first, that it is a comparison and that it has essentially the value of an illustration, and, secondly, that it is decidedly "western" in outlook, since it supposes no differentiation at all in the mode of creative activity of the three divine Persons.

II

As regards the content of the particular but central doctrine we have in view, i.e. the doctrine of the Trinity, and our attitude in Cult and Conduct to the Triune God, there are

many devotional and doctrinal implications of the *ex Patre Filioque tanquam ab uno principio*. We shall consider four, two of a more special character, the others more general.

First. The *Filioque* is another instance of the perfect equality or Divinity of Father and Son, not only with regard to anything or anybody outside the Godhead, but with regard to everything connected with the inner life of God himself. It was felt, by the Latins especially, that if the Spirit did not proceed from the Son as well as from the Father, there would be some kind of perfection or character, apart from fatherhood and sonship, which would not be shared equally by both.

Secondly. Rightly understood, the *tanquam ab uno principio* would tend to correct a popular but not strictly accurate description of the Holy Spirit. It is generally agreed that the Spirit is the mutual Love of Father and Son. But this statement is often (and falsely) taken to imply that the Spirit unites the first two Persons, previously considered as distinct: He is thought to be the bond between Father and Son, the means by which they love one another. That is not the case. He is the expression, the fruit, the result of their love and unity: *a Patre Filioque procedit tanquam ab uno principio*. He is not the giver but the gift of unity—in a way (to some extent) similar to that in which the child is essentially not the bond between man and woman, but the outcome and expression of their mutual love and physical union, and becomes a psychological asset to their concord and affection only because it is first and foremost the ontological product of their oneness. Augustine himself (*De Trin.*, xv, 27, 48) compares the Holy Trinity to the human family, but on very different lines—mainly to emphasize the difference between human generation, in which the child cannot be the simultaneous product of both parents, and the Trinity to which the *ab uno principio* is essential.

Thirdly. Systematically considered, the doctrine of the *Filioque* as well as that of the *tanquam ab uno principio* can be traced, as we have seen, to one fundamental principle, viz. that distinction and distinctions in the Godhead rest on complementary opposition of relations, or, more concretely, that in God Persons are relations and relations are Persons. Nothing seems more abstract and abstruse than a relation, the thinnest of realities in the realm of being: *minimum entium*. But this is not so. The doctrine forces us to a thorough revision of our natural and instinctive egoistical

and fragmentary conception of personality. We naturally think of persons as conscious beings turned inwards and following a centripetal impulse. The "I" is as unbending a symbol as the "moi" or "soi" is loudly self-conscious and obtrusive. In God, personality essentially has its centre of reference in another. The Father is Father, that is himself, only because he is so to another: *ad alium*. The Son is Son inasmuch as he is Son of the Father. And the Spirit is the Spirit only because he is the common Spirit of their perfect unity, dynamic and fruitful not only to themselves (as if, so to speak, they were already, complete in their mutually dependent personalities) but also to him.

This is important ethically as well as dogmatically. Personality, as R. C. Moberly expressed it, is not all-exclusive, but all-inclusive—a view somewhat different from a recently much advertised philosophy of despair, according to which "l'enfer, c'est les autres." Here "the others" are heaven and, for all practical purposes, the intimate being of God himself. This definition of personality, which is the key to the mystery of the Blessed Trinity, is also the key to the difficult mystery of Christ's Atonement or Redemption: his Personality, as the Lord Incarnate, is essentially related to others in his actual infinity of Being, to the potentially indefinite number of his brothers in mankind. Trinity and Incarnation, the two poles on which Christianity and the Christian world revolve, are alike unintelligible if personality is not essentially expansion and charity rather than concentration or egoism.¹

Fourthly. Another conception implied in the same complete doctrine is that, in objective terms, any mission, visible or invisible, of a divine Person *ad extra* involves a corresponding procession *ad intra*: God acts according to the structure of his Being. The same notion may be stated thus in terms of reflex knowledge: any "economic" conception of the Trinity, viz. one defining and describing God in relation to his work in the creation, redemption and glorification of Man and the Cosmos, must rest on a strictly "theological" conception of the Godhead. This, I think, would be quite in keeping with the Eastern view which acknowledges in the natural and supernatural order of creation some reflexion

¹ These implications are not set out at length either in Conciliar expositions or in current treatises of systematic theology. They may be found in R. C. Moberly's masterly *Atonement and Personality* (1901), and in Th. de Regnon's *Études de théologie positive sur la Sainte Trinité*, t.I (1892).

of the internal structure of the Godhead, the Father being the Source of Being, the Son its Form or Shape, the Holy Spirit its Life, Unity and Perfection. To revert to missions and processions, the Father cannot be sent because he does not proceed, the Son is sent only by the Father because he proceeds from the Father alone, while the Father and the Son, as is clear from Holy Writ, send forth the Holy Spirit in his invisible mission into the world of souls, and can do so only because they are jointly his one single eternal principle. I apologize to God and my fellow-Christians for writing "can" and "cannot" of God, but I think the Son could no more send the Father than could Father, Son and Holy Ghost decree that two and two make five.

III

We shall now proceed to consider some more general, but at the same time more formal and methodological (I would fain say "critical") implications of the *Filioque tanquam ab uno principio*. They bear: (1) on the problem of the interconnexions of Life and Thought, or, shall we say, Faith and Order; (2) on Revelation and dogma, on Scripture and the *continuity of doctrine* in Tradition; (3) on the relation between dogma and theology, i.e. on the divine *content* of Faith and the human *form* of its systematic exposition: the problem of the *internal coherence* of doctrine; (4) on the legitimacy, perhaps the necessity, of more than one systematic expression of a revealed truth: the problem of the *unity of dogma and the plurality of metaphysics*.

On my own responsibility, I wish to state briefly in a few propositions, which I submit with due diffidence to the judgment of experts and authorities, what I think are the main points one could make under each of these four major headings in the light of the doctrine examined in this paper.

(1) Revealed truth is an end in itself. There is nothing better, more vital, more important than to know God as he is, through faith in this life, by direct vision in the after-life. Therefore any fuller knowledge of the Godhead, Father, Son and Spirit, is in itself an achievement and the greatest of graces: "This *is* eternal life." It is thus irreverent to God and perfectly irrelevant to ask what *use* is a revealed doctrine to the Christian. Truth—especially truth about God—is not a means to an end. Heresy is death, orthodoxy is life. The doctrinal implications of the *Filioque tanquam*

ab uno principio are to be examined for their own sake.² It is sometimes said that the doctrine of the Trinity has no *appeal* for the Christian. We could answer this particular "objection" starting from its own assumptions and show with St. Thomas (S.T. I, 32, 1 ad 3) that this doctrine brings out in a much clearer light the perfect generosity and love of God in creating. Non-Trinitarian conceptions of a conscious and loving God seem naturally to tend to Pantheism: Boulgakov would agree. But the very first answer is that revelation is of no *use* whatever, any more than a beautiful picture or a glorious day. *Frui* and not *uti* is here the sole proper attitude (cf. Augustine, *De Doctrina christ.*, I, 22). We are sometimes told that these abstruse questions are to be left to theologians and do not interest in the least the common Christian folk. I do not think it is quite like that. If teachers and preachers cannot show that the doctrine of the Trinity is a living and life-giving doctrine, it is their fault, not God's. There is here no question of hairsplitting, but of getting to know God as he is in himself. Men want to know all about their friends and lovers. Why should Christians be less curious or less anxious about God? *Ignoti nulla cupido*. The modern world is exacting high standards of intellectual honesty from its scientists, historians, men of letters. Orthodoxy is honesty in matters of religious thought. One concluding remark on this theme. Nobody denies that mystical experience is a high form of religious experience, and also, that what is essential in mystical experience is not so much the external forms it takes, but its content. This content is bound to differ according to the character of the God the mystic worships. However similar may be

² The question of the *Filioque* cannot in my opinion be subordinated to any question of Ecclesiastical Unity. To try to shelve it as unimportant would be to promote Disunion rather than Reunion; we cannot hope to come together in One Church except in a Church which has one and the same God as the object of its Faith and Worship. Any sort of opportunism here would be out of place. This of course presupposes that the *Filioque tanquam ab uno principio* or, eventually, its negation are considered as dogmatically and not only theologically important. During the discussion Professor V. Lossky and myself agreed that our disagreement, if any (I saw a lesser one than he) bears on *dogma* or *revealed truth*, and is not a question of mere *theologoumena*, freely discussed between Christian schools of thought. This cannot be doubted by Catholics who recognize the œcumenical authority of the Councils of Lyons and Florence. It is not always recognized in either the Anglican or the Orthodox communion: cf. for example, S. Boulgakov in Vol. II of his Trilogie, recently translated into French, *Le Paraclet* (Aubier, Paris, 1946).

the description of the experience of the Christian mystic to that of other, non-Christian mystics, his actual experience of a Triune God cannot but be radically different from the experience of a God who does not reveal Himself as Triune.¹

(2) The *Filioque tanquam ab uno principio* is only a particular instance of the legitimacy of expressing more clearly the content of Revelation, even to the point of including the new expression in the ancient and traditional Creeds. This is one of the points, apparently canonical but in truth dogmatical, which was discussed at the Council of Florence. The right to define so-called "new dogmas" is seen operative in the constant practice of the early Church and it is one of which the Catholic Church makes a very large use, seeing in it more a duty than a right. In its eyes, ὁμοούσιος and *Filioque* are of the same type and one is quite as "scriptural" as the other: as far as Scripture goes, *Filioque* would be perhaps even more scriptural than ὁμοούσιος. What the instrument or agency of this defining power may be is, at present, not relevant. Let it here be borne in mind that the initiative of introducing the *Filioque* was not due to the Papacy; as long as they could, the Popes, faithful to a liturgical conservatism, checked the other Western churches and tried to stop them from adding the *Filioque* to the Creed. It was only when the *Filioque* was opposed on dogmatic grounds and contradicted by ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς,² that "for truth's sake" the Roman See promoted the Hispano-Gallican Creed.

(3) This same doctrine, as we have seen, is closely, perhaps inseparably, bound up with a conception of the divine Persons as living and subsisting relations and processions within the single and absolute substance of the Godhead really identified with each of these subsisting relations. If we do not accept the *Filioque tanquam ab uno principio*, we shall not be able to see how the Son can be distinguished from the Holy Spirit, why there are not two or four rather than three Persons in God, and so forth. We are faced here with the necessity

¹ We do not intend to decide here how far God does in fact let non-Christian mystics have a genuine experience of himself; and even less, how far he may or may not let himself be experienced mystically by non-Christians as the Triune God.

² If this ἐκ is meant to express that the Father is the *first* principle of the Godhead, the *principium sine principio*, the Catholic Church cannot agree that the Spirit proceeds ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς. (cf. Augustine, *Trin.*, xv, xvii, 29.) In this sense the expression would not be contradictory but complementary to the *Filioque*.

of coherent thinking, the necessity of non-contradiction. There can be no question of "evacuating" the Mystery; except for Revelation we could never know that there are in the one God processions or relations constituting the Persons. Our task is to state the Mystery correctly, and in this task it seems that the nearest, least inadequate approach to thought-transcending reality is metaphysics rather than psychology, which is much more anthropomorphic. A systematic exposition in terms of relations, however abstract, seems also much nearer the data of Scripture than any psychological analogy which might be considered more congenial to the modern mind. It is no accident that Augustine introduces "relations" in Book V of his treatise on the Trinity, where he simply states the Christian dogma, and quite clearly proposes his many psychological "explanations" in the later "theological" and "optional" part of the treatise. It is significant also that perhaps the greatest Western "Trinitarian" Council, the eleventh Council of Toledo, although thoroughly Augustinian, expounds nearly all the possible aspects of the doctrine of relations and completely ignores the typically Augustinian psychological exposition—a sign perhaps that it considered the former to belong to the dogma of the Holy Trinity in a way that the latter did not.

(4) As is well known, there are two conflicting formulations of the doctrine, each of which is to be found in both the Eastern and Western traditions, but the one prevailing in the West, the other in the East: *Ex Patre Filioque*, in which the Greek preposition ἐκ is applied to the Son as principle of the Holy Ghost and *Ex Patre per Filium procedit Spiritus*, in which διὰ is applied to the Son and ἐκ reserved for the Father as connoting only the *first* origin. It is generally said that the first can be diagrammatically represented by a triangle, the second by an angle or better by a straight line. Each formula has its advantages and disadvantages. Bessarion, probably the greatest theologian present at the Council of Florence, and equally well informed on the Catholic and Orthodox positions, states the case perfectly (P.G. 161, 397c). In the divine Processions we have equality between the Persons but also order. Now ἐκ excellently connotes equality, but says nothing about order; διὰ expresses order but leaves out equality. *Ex Patre per Filium* tells us that there is a definite order, without inferiority, between Father and Son; that the Father is the Only First Source of everything

in the Godhead, that the Son derives his active power of spiration from the Father. It makes it "imaginatively" easier for us to "understand" that Father and Son are *one* principle of the Holy Spirit and not two distinct principles. On the other hand, it has the disadvantage that theoretically one could be led to think that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Father—the error of the Macedonians, condemned by the Second Œcumenical Council (which therefore never thought of adding the *Filioque*, as it was not denied by the heretics). The real disadvantage is that the Son might appear as being only the instrumental principle of the Holy Spirit, and, as such, inferior to the Father. The Latin formula avoids this danger, but hardly takes into account the order of procession and spiration, viz. that the active spiration in the Father is original, whereas in the Son it is filial, i.e. wholly *derived* from the Father. Moreover the *Filioque* taken alone tends to represent the Father and the Son as *two distinct* principles of the Spirit. This would be only half the truth, and if maintained with an implicit negation of the other half, it would become an αἰρεσις. When the Latins forget or omit to complete the *Filioque* with its necessary complement and correction, the *tanquam ab uno principio*, they take upon themselves, I think, the main responsibility for the dogmatical misunderstanding between Orthodoxy and Catholicism. In the Creed one cannot, of course, say everything; many important dogmas on which East and West agree, the Eucharist for example, are not even mentioned. But it is unfortunate that the *Filioque* was added to the Creed at a time when the complementary *tanquam ab uno principio* was hardly present, so far as we can make out, to the reflective consciousness of the Western Church. It is typical—and sad—that the otherwise very fully elaborated doctrine of the eleventh Council of Toledo (which is *not* œcumenical), though explicit on the *Filioque*, is quite silent on the *tanquam ab uno principio*. This is the more surprising—and significant—that the conciliar doctrine is wholly Augustinian, and Augustine is as outspoken about the *ab uno principio* as he is about the *Filioque*: he affirms both in the dogmatic part of his treatise (*De Trin.*, v. 14; P.L. 42, 920). It is only, so far as I can see, under the pressure of the controversy with the Greeks and through the desire to promote the reunion of divided Christendom that the Catholic Church, largely "Western" in its outlook, rediscovered in its own tradition the other "half" of the dogma of the procession of the Holy Spirit, and in the great œcumen-

ical Councils of United Christendom at Lyons and Florence anathematized those who denied either the *Filioque* or the *tanquam ab uno principio*. The Council of Florence, moreover, declared that the Greek formula *ex Patre per Filium* was quite as correct as the so-called Latin one *ex Patre Filioque*. It thus "canonized" two distinct and complementary expressions of the same dogma, expressions which, as de Regnon justly observed, cannot be said to be simply equivalent or interchangeable if one considers the particular content and connotations they emphasize. In my opinion the Catholic Church could suppress the *Filioque* from the Creed or add to the Creed the *tanquam ab uno principio* which has twice been solemnly defined. A suppression such as this would not be without precedent, for the Council of Constantinople in 381 dropped from the Nicene Creed the important $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu \epsilon\kappa \tau\eta\varsigma \omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\varsigma$. Whether such suppression or addition would avoid the possibility of anyone thinking that the Catholic Church expressed only half a truth, or something true indeed but misleading, is too complex a question for me to discuss here.

If the facts are here recorded faithfully and interpreted without too pronounced a bias,¹ one might feel justified in drawing from them conclusions—not unimportant conclusions—concerning the possibility or necessity of expressing one and the same dogma by means of more than one set of metaphysical categories. If this inference is justified, the much

¹ It is fair to add that in the discussion on this paper it was denied, on the Orthodox side, that the *ex Patre per Filium* represents the classical Orthodox systematization: it was said to be a compromise suggested by those Eastern theologians who desired reunion with Rome.—A theory was mentioned during the discussion according to which the Spirit *proceeds from the Father to the Son*, and which was to be set forth in other papers, but the promised developments were not forthcoming.—It was also suggested that the Orthodox Church might just manage to accept the Trinitarian exposition of the eleventh Council of Toledo (anterior to the Schism), that is, the *Filioque* but without the *tanquam ab uno principio*: in my view, it will be evident, a most peculiar position; but I understand (or think I understand) the *Filioque* thus "tolerated" to refer exclusively to the temporal mission of the Holy Ghost (with no connotation of the eternal procession), a view which cannot, in my opinion, have been that of the Council, whose main object seems to have been to define the eternal relations between the divine Persons.—I do not know if the already mentioned "procession of the Holy Ghost *from the Father to the Son*" may not be meant to express the evangelical doctrine (notably in Luke) representing the Spirit as driving, leading, inspiring Jesus, a doctrine which I think expressly connotes the humanity of Jesus and the fact that he is the fulfilment of the prophetic figures, which he transcends even with regard to his human nature.

controverted dogma of the procession of the Spirit is not or should not be, as is generally thought, the main dividing line between Eastern and Western Christianity, but, paradoxically, their central, God-centred, uniting point. East and West would here not exclude each other but come together to express fully and perfectly in union what they can express only imperfectly in "division": the doctrine of the Spirit of the Father and the Son's Unity. On theoretical lines, it would appear that one dogma at least is officially expressed by the Catholic Church, united at Lyons and Florence, in two formulations which are not strictly equivalent or identical but complementary. If this plurality of systematic exposition is possible or even necessary for one revealed truth, it might not be impossible or unnecessary for other data of the one divine Revelation.

ADDITIONAL NOTE

Having been asked to prepare this paper at very short notice and without any theological library at hand, I was unable, to my great regret, either to re-examine more thoroughly the Orthodox position (on which I have no special competence), or even to take into account the modern "Western" views on the *Filioque* outside the Church of Rome. Officially, I think, and considering the Creeds, all "Western" dogmatical confessions agree fundamentally with the Catholic Church and accept the *Filioque*. It would have been interesting to try to ascertain what their attitude is today to the "Florentine" *tanquam ab uno principio*. It is easy to see how difficult such a survey would have been, for the whole question depends on the degree in which these denominations recognize the pre-Tridentine Councils and Creeds as authoritative. But perhaps these circumstances were not as unfortunate as they might appear since they forced me to concentrate on the official doctrine of the Church and on its many implications as I see them, apart from any œcumenical or ecclesiastical pre-occupations. They allowed me, perforce, to leave out controversy—as far as it is possible in so controverted a subject. If I may put it rather bluntly, I was not interested to find out what was stressed in the doctrine of the *Filioque* in order to favour R union, but what, *in itself and for itself*, was the complete

and authoritative Catholic doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit. And I found that this doctrine, as I see it, bare but complete, stripped of its theological theories but including all its defined and traditional elements, has the power to remove the dogmatic disagreement—or misunderstanding—between the Orthodox Church and the Catholic Church.

It is accordingly clear why I do not want to apologize for not having considered the so-called psychological exposition of the doctrine of the Trinity, so magnificently set forth by St. Thomas. (Psychological is not here opposed to ontological, since Intelligence and Will are ontological faculties of the human soul, and in the divine Being ontological attributes identical with that Being.) This theory, which I hold to be true and which is part of the common teaching of the Catholic Church today, does not seem to me to belong, in all its elements, to the strictly dogmatical exposition of the Trinity. With regard, in particular, to the procession of the Holy Ghost, de Regnon remarks (t. II, p. 144): "Cette procession est par voie d'amour. Ce corollaire, notons-le cependant, n'est authentiqué par aucune définition dogmatique." With regard to the procession of the Son *secundum intellectum*, the specific dogmatic "qualification" is more difficult to state: it seems to me, on the ground of the Johannine Prologue interpreted by the unanimous tradition of the Church, that it would be heresy to deny that the Son is the Word; but what the formal, explicit and emphasized content of the term may be is difficult to ascertain. If we connect it mainly with the Semitic *memra* as God's Word and Power (*dabar* connotes speech and action), or with the Greek *Logos*, which connotes rather *thought* and speech, we shall respectively neglect or emphasize the *processio secundum intellectum*. The alternatives are perhaps to be connected with a predominantly "economical" or with a predominantly "theological" (i.e. with, or without reference to creation) conception of the divine Trinity.

Not only do the Greek Fathers ignore this theory—a fact which is in my opinion insufficient to deny its revealed character—but in the Western tradition itself, long after Augustine, other theories have been proposed which seem to be incompatible with it and which have never been thought to contradict revealed traditional truth: Richard of St. Victor is an outstanding example of this independence and originality. Whatever the Patristic tradition may have been, I set out

to discover the doctrine of the Trinity as expounded by the Councils ; it seemed to me a *minimum* required of, and, with due reservations too intricate to enter into here, a *maximum* allowed to a theologian who was trying to state, without considering schools of thought, the unanimous and authentic and authoritative doctrine of the Trinity in the Catholic Church. I did not feel bound or entitled to consider "particular" Doctors of the Church—even the acknowledged Doctor "Communis." To take into account the views of St. Thomas, true as I hold them to be, could only bring confusion to the task, difficult enough in itself, of proposing the doctrine as set forth by the Councils. No more did I consider Augustine's theory, the original genius who started and very fully developed this line of thought—who is moreover the greatest Father of the Western Church and perhaps of the whole Church. I only mentioned him in so far as the Councils took up or passed over his dogmatic expositions or theological explanations. Trying to distinguish "theology" from "dogma," I am conscious of raising a leading question on the nature of Revealed Truth and its development. But if it was fair on my part to attempt to state my scope and general position in this particular question, I do not think I can be expected to give in a paper with a limited object, a detailed account of my views on one of the most difficult and elusive points of dogmatic theology.

PAUL HENRY, S.J.

The Procession of the Holy Spirit in the Orthodox Triadology

WHETHER we like it or not, the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit was the sole dogmatic ground of the separation of the Eastern and Western churches. All the other divergences which accompanied or followed the first dogmatic controversy about the Filioque, in the measure in which they too had a certain dogmatic importance, are more or less dependent upon that original issue. This is only too easy to understand, when we take into account the importance of the mystery of the Trinity, in its place in the whole body of Christian teaching. Thus the polemical

battle between the Greeks and the Latins was fought principally about the question of the Holy Spirit. If other questions have arisen and taken the first place in more recent inter-confessional debates, that is chiefly because that the dogmatic plane on which the thought of theologians operates is no longer the same as it was in the mediaeval period. Ecclesiological problems determine the pre-occupations of Christian thought more and more as time goes on. This is as it should be. But on the other hand the tendency to underestimate and even to despise the pneumatological debates of the past, which may be noticed among modern Orthodox theologians (and especially among Russians, who are too often ungrateful to Byzantium) shows that these theologians lack both dogmatic sense and reverence for the living tradition, in being ready to renounce their fathers. It is true that it is always becoming necessary to make new evaluations of the truths which the Church stated in the past, in order to meet the needs of the present; but the required revaluation is never a devaluation; it is the restatement of the value of that which was said in a different epoch under different circumstances. It is the duty of the historian to inform us about the circumstances in which a dogma was first required and to state the historical implications of dogmas; but it is not his duty, as a historian, to judge dogmatic values as such. If this is not remembered, there is a danger that the history of theology will become a "Grey Eminence," or rather a "Lay Eminence," in the Church, seeking to establish by the methods of secular science, a new canon of tradition. This is a sort of Caesaro-papism of the scholars, which might succeed in imposing its authority over the Church, if tradition were not, for her, a living reality of revelation in the Holy Spirit.

Thus, for example, the learned Russian theologian, V. Bolotov, an eminent historian of theology, on the occasion of the Bonn conversations with the Old Catholics, considered himself able to declare, on the basis of an analysis of Patristic texts, that the Filioque hardly constitutes an "impedimentum dirimens" in the path of dogmatic reconciliation.¹ According to Bolotov, the question concerned two "theologoumena," expressing in two different verbal forms, the "a Filio" and the "per Filium," (διὰ Υἱοῦ) the doctrine of the procession

¹ Thesen über das Filioque (von einem russischen Theologen) in the *Revue Internationale de Théologie*, published by the Old Catholics, at Berne, Vol. VI (1898), 681-712.

the Holy Spirit. Bolotov was too good a historian of theology to conclude that the doctrines on both sides were identical. But he lacked the dogmatic sense to perceive the true positions of the two verbal forms in two different triadologies. Even as a historian, he made a mistake in treating the "a Filio" as the opposite of the "per Filium," as if these were the two formulas expressing the doctrine of the hypostatic procession of the Holy Spirit. It was the "a Patre filioque" and the ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Πατρὸς which, as formulas about the procession, came into conflict and so exposed a divergence in the theology of the Trinity.¹ The "per Filium" (διὰ Υἱοῦ) interpreted in the sense of a mediation of the Son in the hypostatic procession of the Holy Spirit was a formula of concord adopted by the partisans of union in the thirteenth century, precisely because their triadology was not the same as that of the adversaries of the filioque. By adopting the interpretation of the "per Filium" proper to the Latinizing Greeks, Bolotov minimized the doctrinal divergence between the two Triadologies; therefore he could write about two tolerable "theological opinions."

Our task here will not be that of a historian. We shall leave on one side all questions concerning the origins of verbal formulas. We shall even admit the possibility of an Orthodox interpretation of the Filioque as it first appeared, for example, at Toledo.² We are not dealing with forms of words here; we are dealing with two theological doctrines, as they have been constituted. We shall try to show you the outlines of the Trinitarian theology which Orthodox theologians regard themselves as obliged to defend, when they are confronted with the doctrine of the eternal personal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, not from one principle of being. We shall confine ourselves to placing before you certain theological principles, of a general character, about the ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Πατρὸς and the διὰ Υἱοῦ. We shall not enter into the controversies of the

¹ Bolotov must have recognized, implicitly, the radical character of the divergences, since, after all, he categorically denied the *causal character* of the mediation of the Son in the procession of the Holy Spirit. V. op. cit. p. 700: Aber wenn auch in den innersten geheimnisvollsten Beziehungen des trinitarischen Lebens begründet, ist das "durch den Sohn" frei von dem leisesten Astrich einer *Kausalitäts* Bedeutung (italics Bolotov's).

² A study of the Filioquism of the Spanish Councils of the fifth, sixth and seventh centuries would be of capital importance, that a dogmatic dissociation of these formulas might be made. Here the disinterested work of historical theology could be really useful to the Church.

past in detail. Our sole aim will be to make the Orthodox Triadology better understood.

II

Roman Catholic and Orthodox theologians agree in recognizing that a certain anonymity characterizes the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. While the words "Father" and "Son" denote very clear personal distinctions, are in no sense interchangeable, and cannot in any case refer to the common nature of the Three Persons, the words "Holy" and "Spirit" have not that advantage. Indeed we say that God is spirit and that He is holy; that may mean the common nature, or any one of the Persons; the triple Sanctus of the canon of the Mass alludes to Three Holy Persons having the common holiness of their identical Godhead. Taken in itself, the name of the Holy Spirit might thus be applied, not to a personal distinction, but to the common nature of the Three. In that sense, St. Thomas Aquinas is right in saying that the Third Person of the Holy Trinity has no proper name and that the name Holy Spirit has been given to him according to Scriptural usage. (*Accommodatum ex usu Scripturae* I q 36 a 1). We meet the same difficulty when we wish to define the mode of origin of the Holy Spirit, contrasting his "procession" with the "generation" of the Son. Like the name "Holy Spirit," the term procession cannot be considered to be, in itself, an expression which exclusively envisages the Third Person. It is a general term, which could be applied, "in abstracto," to the Son. Latin theology even speaks of "*duae processioness*." We leave on one side, for the moment, the question of the extent to which such an abstract way of treating of the mystery of the Holy Trinity is legitimate. The one point which we stress here is that the term procession has not the precision of the term generation. The latter term, while preserving the mysterious character of the divine Fatherhood and Sonship, states a definite relationship between two persons; that is not the case with the term procession, which is an indefinite expression, confronting us with the mystery of an anonymous person, whose personal origin is presented to us negatively: it is not generation; it is other than that of the Son.¹ If we seek to treat these expressions positively, we find an image of the economy of the Holy Spirit, rather than an image of his personal character, the procession of a divine force accom-

¹ Greg Naz. Or. xx, 11; Or. xxxi, 8, P.G. xxxv, 1077C, xxxvi, 141E

ishing sanctification. We reach a paradoxical conclusion : that we know of the Holy Spirit refers to his economy ; that we do not know makes us venerate his person, as we venerate the ineffable diversity of the consubstantial Three. In the fourth century the question of the Trinity was examined in a Christological context and was raised in connexion with the nature of the Logos. The homoousion, while assuming the diversity of the Three Persons, was meant to express the identity in the Trinity, by stressing the unity of the divine common nature, against all subordinationism. In the ninth century the pneumatological controversy between the Latins and the Greeks raised the question of the Trinity in connexion with the person of the Holy Spirit. Both contending parties, while assuming the identity of the Three in nature, intended to express the personal diversity in the Trinity. The former party strove to base personal diversity on the foundation of the homoousion, starting from natural identity. The latter party, more conscious of the antinomic character of the doctrine of the Trinity (in the antinomy of $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$ and $\upsilon\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$) while taking into account consubstantiality, stressed the monarchy of the Father, as a safeguard against all danger of a " New Sabellianism."¹ Two doctrines of the personal procession of the Holy Spirit, " a Patre filioque" and $\epsilon\kappa\ \mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$, stand for two different solutions of the question of personal diversity in the Trinity, two different Triadologies. It is important that we should describe these Triadologies in outline.

III

Starting from the fact that the personal characteristic mark of the Holy Spirit remains indefinite, the fact that he is anonymous, Latin theology sought to draw a positive conclusion as to his mode of origin. The name Holy Spirit being, in the same sense, common to the Father and the Son (both are Father and both are spirit) it should denote a person related to the Father and the Son in respect of what they have in common.² Even when the matter in hand is the procession, as the mode of origin of the Third Person, the expression, procession, which in itself does not signify any mode of origin distinguishable from generation, should denote a relation of the Father and the Son together, that it may be the basis

¹ The expression is that of St. Photios in *Mystagogia* c, 9, P.G. cii, 289B. $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \beta\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\nu\ \eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\ \upsilon\ \Sigma\alpha\beta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\iota\omicron\varsigma$, $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \tau\iota\ \tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu\ \eta\mu\iota\sigma\alpha\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\omega\nu$.
² St. Thom. i a q 36 a 1, ref. St. Aug. *De Trin.* i, 11.

of existence of a Third Person, distinct from the two others. As a *relation of opposition* cannot be founded except between two terms, the Holy Spirit should proceed from the Father and the Son, inasmuch as they represent a unity.¹ That is the meaning of the formula in which the Holy Spirit is said to proceed from the Father and the Son, as from one principle of spiration.²

One cannot deny the logical clarity of this process of reasoning, which seeks to base the personal diversity in the Trinity on the principle of *relations of opposition*. This principle in the theology of the Trinity, formulated by St. Thomas Aquinas, becomes unavoidable the moment that the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit "ab utroque" is once admitted. It pre-supposes these three positions: (1) That the relations are the basis of the persons³ which are to be defined by their mutual *opposition*, the First to the Second, and these Two to the Third. (2) That the First Person and Second together are a non-personal unity, in that they give rise to a further *relation of opposition*. (3) That therefore the origin of the Persons of the Trinity, in general, is impersonal, having its real basis in the one essence, differentiated by internal relations. The general character of this Triadology may be thus described: it gives pre-eminence to the Unity of the nature, rather than to the Trinity of the Persons; in it there is an ontological primacy of the essence over the hypostases.

The attitude of Orthodox thought, when confronted with the mysterious name of the Holy Spirit, denoting a divine economy rather than a personal mark of distinction, is far from being simply a refusal to define his personal diversity. On the contrary, because that diversity or (to speak more generally) the diversity of the Three Persons, is presented as something absolute, we refuse to admit the conception of a relation of origin which *opposes* the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son, as one principle of being. If this were

¹ St. Thomas uses these expressions: *relativa oppositio*, *oppositio relationis*, *relatio* (or *respectus*) *ad suum oppositum*, and *relationes oppositae*, to signify what we have here called *relations of opposition*. The expression, *opposition relationis*, refers to the essence. In saying what we have said, we do not in any way misrepresent St. Thomas's thought, for the idea of *opposition* is implied in his definition of a relation: "De ratione autem relationis est respectus unius ad alterem, secundum quem aliquid alteri opponitur relative." (I a q 28, a 3.)

² I q 36, a 2 and 7.

³ St. Thomas goes further; for him the persons of the Trinity *are* relations (*Persona est relatio* I a q 40, a 2).

admitted, we consider that the personal diversity in the Trinity would be made a matter of relations. Inasmuch as the Holy Spirit is One Person, the Father and the Son, to Whom he is thus related, appear in their natural absence of distinction; inasmuch as the Father and the Son are Two distinct Persons, the Holy Spirit only represents their unity in their identical nature. Here the logical impossibility of *any opposition* between three terms intervenes, and the logical clarity of this Triadological system is shown to be extremely superficial. Indeed, on these lines, we cannot reach a mode of distinguishing the Three Persons from one another without confounding them with the essence, in one way or in another. The absolute diversity of the Three cannot be based in their *relations of opposition* without admitting, implicitly or explicitly, the primacy of the essence over the persons, by assuming a relative (and therefore secondary) basis for personal diversity, as contrasted with natural identity. But that is exactly what Orthodox theology cannot admit.¹

Against the doctrine of the procession "ab utroque" the Orthodox affirmed that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone. (ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Πατρὸς.) This form of words, while verbally it may seem novel, in its doctrinal tenor represents nothing more than a very plain affirmation of the traditional teaching about the monarchy of the Father, as the unique source of the divine Persons.² It may be objected that this form of words, ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Πατρὸς, provides no place for any *relation of opposition* between the Second Person of the Trinity and the Third Person. But those who say this overlook the fact that the very principle of *relations of opposition* is unacceptable to Orthodox Triadology; the very term, "relations of origin," has not the same sense in Orthodox theology as it has among the defenders of the Filioque.

¹ Fr. de Régnon enquires why the Filioquist considerations were never developed in the rich works of the Greek Fathers. Concerning these considerations, he asks: "N'est-ce pas ici la preuve qu'elles ne se sont pas présentées à leur esprit dans leur conception de la Trinité?" And he replies with a significant avowal: "En effet, toutes, elles supposent que, dans l'ordre des concepts, la nature soit antérieure à la personne, et que celle-ci se montre comme une sorte de floraison de celle-là." (*Études de théologie positive sur la Sainte Trinité*, i, p. 309.) He also writes (*Ibid.* p. 433): "La philosophie Latine envisage d'abord la nature en elle-même et poursuit jusqu'au suppôt; la philosophie Grecque envisage d'abord le suppôt et y pénètre ensuite pour trouver la nature. Le Latin considère la personnalité comme une mode de la nature, le Grec considère la nature comme le contenu de la personne."

² St. John of Damascus, *De Fide* i, 8, P.G. xciv, 820-4A. St. Greg. Naz. loc. cit., note 4.

When it is stated that the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone is distinguished in an ineffable manner from the eternal generation of the Son, who is begotten of the Father alone, no attempt is being made to recognize a *relation of opposition* between the Son and the Holy Spirit, not merely because the procession is ineffable (the generation of the Son is no less ineffable) but also because (speaking more generally) the relations of origin in the Trinity, both Sonship and Procession, cannot be considered as the basis of the existence of the Persons, or as that which determines their diversity, since their diversity is absolute. When we say that the procession of the Holy Spirit is a relation which differs absolutely from the generation of the Son, we are taking their common source as our starting-point and indicating the difference between them, as to mode of origin (τρόπος υπάρξεως).¹ We do this in order to affirm that community of origin in no way effects the absolute diversity, as between the Son and the Holy Spirit.

Here it may be stated that the relations only express personal diversity; they are not the basis of it. It is the absolute diversity of the Three Persons which determines their relations to one another, in their differences, and not *vice versa*. Here thought stands still, confronted by the impossibility of defining a personal existence, in its absolute difference from any other, and must adopt a negative attitude. We may declare that God the Father, he who is without beginning, ὁ ἀναρχος, is not the Son, nor is he the Holy Spirit; the begotten Son is neither the Holy Spirit, nor the Father; the Holy Spirit, "who proceedeth from the Father," is neither the Father nor the Son.² It is not *relations of opposition*, but relations of diversity about which we ought to speak here.³ To take the positive way, and to envisage the relations of origin otherwise than as signs of the inexpressible diversity of the Persons, is to suppress the absolute character of that diversity, i.e. to make the Trinity a matter of relationships and, in some sense, to depersonalize it.

¹ More exactly, mode of subsistence. The expression is found, e.g., in St. John of Damascus, *De Fide* i, 8, P.G. xciv, 828D. i, 10, P.G. xciv, 837.

It is also much used by George of Cyprus, *Apologia* P.G. cxlii, 254A, etc.

² Greg. Naz. Or. xxxi, 9 P.G. xxxvi, 141D-4A.

³ St. Mark of Ephesus, in his polemic against the Latins, criticizes the Thomist principle of *opposition between the persons*, affirming the principle of their diversity. Cap. syllog. contra Latinos c, xxiv, P.G. clxi, 189-93.

The positive attitude appertaining to the Filioquist Triadology brings about a certain rationalization of the Trinitarian dogma, insofar as it conceals the fundamental antinomy of οὐσία and ὑπόστασις. One has the impression that the heights of theology have been deserted in a descent to the level of religious philosophy. The negative attitude characteristic of Orthodox thought, on the other hand, places us face to face with the primordial antinomy of absolute identity and no less absolute diversity in God; it does not seek to conceal the antinomy but to express it fittingly, so that the mystery of the Trinity may make us transcend the philosophical way of thinking and the Truth may make us free from our human limitations, by altering our mode of understanding. If in the former way of thinking Faith seeks understanding, in order to transpose revelation on to the philosophical plane, in the latter way of thinking Understanding seeks the realities of faith, in order to change itself, by becoming more and more open to the admission of the mysteries of revelation. Since the dogma of the Trinity is the keystone of the arch of theology, and belongs to the region which the Greek Fathers called "theologia," *par excellence*, it is comprehensible that a divergence in this culminating point (insignificant as it may seem at first sight) should have a decisive importance. The difference between the two Triadologies determines, on both sides, the whole character of theological thought. That is so to such an extent that it becomes difficult to give the same name of theology to these two different ways of thinking about divine realities, without equivocation.

IV

If the Personal diversity in God is to be presented as a primordial fact, not to be deduced from any other principle, that does not mean that the essential identity of the Three is ontologically posterior to their Personal diversity. The Orthodox doctrine of the Trinity is not a counter-blast to Filioquism; it does not run to the other extreme. As we have already said, the relations or origin signify the Personal diversity of the Three, but also (no more and no less) they predicate their essential identity; in that the Son and the Holy Spirit are distinguished from the Father, we venerate Three Persons; in that they are One with him, we confess their consubstantiality.¹ Thus the monarchy of the Father main-

¹ Greg. Naz., op. cit., 14, 148D-9A.

tains the equilibrium between the Nature and the Persons, without coming down too heavily on either side.¹ There is neither an impersonal substance nor non-consubstantial Persons. The One Nature and the Three Persons are presented simultaneously to our spirits; neither is the One prior to the Three, nor are the Three prior to the One. The origin of the Persons is not impersonal, as it is referred to the Person of the Father; but it is not to be considered apart from their common possession of the same essence, the "essence unshared of the Three sharers."² Otherwise we should be concerned with Three Divine Individuals, Three Gods bound together with an abstract idea of Godhead. On the other hand, consubstantiality being the non-personal identity of the Three, in that they have (or rather *are*) a common essence, the unity of the Three Persons is not to be considered apart from the monarchy of the Father, Who is the *principle* of the common possession by the Three of the same One Essence; otherwise we should be concerned with a simple essence, differentiated by relationships.³

It may be asked whether, in seeking to avoid the Semi-Sabellianism of the Latins, their Greek adversaries did not fall into subordinationism, by their emphasis on the monarchy of the Father. This might perhaps seem all the more likely to happen, because in Greek Patristic literature the idea of causality is often applied to the Person of the Father. The Father is called the cause (αἰτία) of the Persons of the Son and the Holy Spirit, or even the Godhead-source (πηγαία-θεότης). Sometimes he is simply named as "God," with the definite article (ὁ θεός) or even αὐτοθεός.⁴

It is worth while to recall here what we have said before about the negative attitude of Orthodox thought, an attitude which makes a radical difference to the value of philosophical terms, as applied to God. Not only the image of the cause, but also such terms as "production, procession, and origin," should be envisaged as inadequate expressions, describing a reality which is foreign to all becoming, all process and all beginning. Just as the relations or origin mean something different from a *relation of opposition* in Triadology, so causality is no more than a somewhat defective image, whereby it is

¹ St. Photios compares the Trinity to a pair of scales, in which the needle represents the Father, and the two platforms represent the Son and the Holy Spirit. *Amphilochia*, P.G. ci, 896.

² Greg. Naz., loc cit.

³ Greg. Naz. Or., xlii, P.G. xxxvi, 476B.

⁴ Greg. Naz. Or. ii 38, P.G. XXXV, 445.

desired to express the idea of the Personal Unity which determines the origins of the Son and the Holy Spirit. This unique cause is not prior to his effects, for in the Trinity there is no priority and posteriority. He is not superior to his effects, for the perfect cause cannot produce inferior effects. He is thus the cause of the equality of his effects with himself. The causality ascribed to the Person of the Father (in that he begets the Son and causes the Holy Spirit to proceed) expresses the same idea as the monarchy of the Father, i.e. that the Father is the personal *principle* of unity of the Three, the source of their common possession of the same content, the One identical essence.

The expressions, "Godhead-source" and "Source of the Godhead," do not imply that the divine Essence is subject to the Person of the Father, but only mean that the Person of the Father is the basis of their common possession of the same essence, because the Person of the Father is not to be identified with the essence, not being the sole Person of the Godhead. In a certain sense it can be said that the Father *is* this common possession of the divine essence, in common with the Son and the Holy Spirit; and even that he would not be a divine Person if he were merely a Monad; he would then be identified with the divine Essence. Here it may be useful to recall that St. Cyril of Alexandria regarded the name "Father" as superior to the name "God," because the name "God" is given to God in respect of his relations with beings of a different nature.¹

If the Father is sometimes called simply God (ὁ θεός, or even αὐτοθεός), nevertheless we cannot find in any Orthodox writer expressions which treat consubstantiality as participation by the Son and the Holy Spirit in the essence of the Father.² Each Person is God by nature, not by participation in the nature of another.

The Father is the cause of the other Persons, in that he is not his essence, i.e. in that he has not his essence for himself alone. What the image of causality is intended to express is the idea that the Father, being not merely an essence but a Person, is thereby the cause of the other consubstantial Persons having the same essence.

¹ Thesaurus assert. 5 P.G. lxxv, 65, 68.

² Such a concept may be found in the works of Origen, vide, e.g. On St. John ii, 2, P.G. xiv, 109. Th. Leske, *Theologie der Logosmystik bei Origenes*, Münster 1938, may be usefully consulted.

V

With reference to the Father, causality expresses the idea that he is a divine Person only in that he is the cause of other divine Persons ; he could not be fully and absolutely Personal unless the Son and the Holy Spirit were equal to him in the common possession of the same nature and *were* that same nature. This idea might make people think that each of the Persons of the Trinity could be regarded as the cause of the other two, in that he is not the common essence ; that would be equivalent to making the Persons a matter of relationships in a new way, by changing Them into conventional and inter-changeable signs of three diversities. Roman Catholic theology avoids this kind of personal relativism by professing belief in the procession of the Holy Spirit “*ab utroque*,” i.e. by falling into an *impersonal relativism*, that of *relations of opposition*, regarded as the basis of the existence of the Three Persons, in the unity of a simple essence. Orthodox theology takes as its starting-point the initial antinomy of essence and hypostasis, and avoids personal relativism by attributing causality to the Father alone. The monarchy of the Father sets-up irreversible relationships, which enable us to distinguish the two other Persons from the Father, and yet to relate them to the Father, as a concrete *principle* of unity in the Trinity. We have to confess not only the unity of the One Nature in the Three, but also the unity of the Three Persons of the one identical nature. St. Gregory Nazianzus expresses the idea clearly : “Each considered in himself is wholly and entirely God, the Son as well as the Father, the Holy Spirit as well as the Son ; but each keeps his personal *character* ; the Three together God, each God because of the consubstantiality, the Three God because of the monarchy.”¹

According to St. Maximus, God is identically a Monad and a Triad.² He is not merely One and Three ; he is the One which is equal to Three and the Three which is equal to One. ($1=3$ and $3=1$.) That is to say, here we are not concerned with number as signifying quantity : absolute diversities cannot be made the subjects of sums of addition ; they have not even contrast (or *opposition*) in common. If, as we have said, the Personal God cannot be a Monad, neither can he be a Dyad. He must be more than One unique

¹ De Sancto Baptismo Or. xl, 41, P.G. xxxvi, 417B.

² Cap. Theol. second century, i, P.G. xc, 1125A.

Person; but the Dyad is always an *opposition* of two terms; in that sense it cannot signify absolute diversity. When we say that God is Triune we are emerging from the series of countable or calculable numbers.¹ The procession of the Holy Spirit is an infinite "passage beyond the dyad or pair of *opposites*"; it is this "passage beyond" (*dépassement*) which consecrates the absolute (as opposed to relative) diversity among the Persons. This "passage beyond the Dyad" is not that the Persons are an infinite series, but that the procession of the Third Person has an infinite character; the Triad suffices to denote the Living God of revelation.² If God is a Monad equal to a Triad ($3=1$), there is no place in him for a Dyad. The contrast or *opposition between* the Father and the Son, which provides a place for the idea of a Dyad, is artificial; it is produced by illicit abstraction. Where the Trinity is concerned, we are confronted with the Three or with the One, but never with the Two.

The procession of the Holy Spirit "ab utroque" does not signify the "passage beyond the Dyad" but rather stands for the re-absorption of the Dyad in the Monad, the return of the Monad upon himself. It is a dialectic of the Monad opening-out into the Dyad and closing again in his simplicity.³ On the contrary, the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone, by emphasizing the monarchy of the Father, as the concrete *principle* of the unity of the Three, passes beyond the Dyad without a return to primordial unity, without needing that God should re-fold himself in the simplicity of the essence; for this reason the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone confronts us with the mystery of the Tri-unity. It is not a question of a simple essence, self-enclosed, upon which *relations of opposition* have been super imposed in order to dress the God of philosophy in the garments of the God of the Christian revelation. We say, "*the simple Trinity*" (τριάς ἀπλή), and this antinomic expression, found in the Orthodox hymn-writers,⁴ signifies a simplicity which the absolute diversity of the Three Persons cannot in any way make into a matter of relationships.

¹ St. Basil seems to be expressing this idea in xlv of his book, "On the Holy Spirit," P.G. xxxii, 149B.

² Greg. Naz. "On peace" iii, Or. xxiii, 10, P.G. xxxv, 1161. "On the Feast of the Resurrection," Or. xlv, P.G. xxxvi, 628C.

³ The idea of the Holy Spirit as the mutual Love of the Father and the Son is characteristic, in this sense, of Filioquist Triadology.

⁴ The Great Penitential Canon of St. Andrew of Crete, iii, vi and vii.

VI

When we speak of the Personal God, who cannot be a Monad, and when, bearing in mind the celebrated Plotinian passage in the works of St. Gregory Nazianzus, we say that the Trinity is a "passage beyond the Dyad," this in no sense implies the Neo-Platonist idea of "*bonum diffusivum sui*" or any kind of moral basis for the doctrine of the Trinity, such as (e.g.) love seeking to communicate his own plenitude to others. While the Father shares the essence with the Son and the Holy Spirit, and yet in that sharing remains one and undivided, this is neither an act of will nor an act of internal necessity; in more general terms, it is not an *act* at all, but is the eternal mode of existence of the Trinity. It is the primordial reality, which cannot be based on any notion other than itself, for the Trinity is prior to all the qualities attributed to God, such as goodness, intelligence, love, power, and infinity, the qualities in which God manifests himself and is made known.

Roman Catholic theology, when presenting the relations of origin as notional acts, and speaking of the two processions, "*per modum intellectus*" and "*per modum voluntatis*," commits an inadmissible error of confusion concerning the Trinity, from the point of view of Orthodox theology. The external qualities of God, His intellect, will, and love, are here introduced into the internal life of the Trinity, and are used to denote the relations between the Persons. This line of thought gives us divine Individuality rather than the Trinity of Persons; this individuality is conscious of His own essential content in thought, and loves himself, by knowing himself (the procession of the Holy Spirit "*ab utroque*," *per modum voluntatis* or *per modum amoris*, with the generation of the Son, *per modum intellectus*).

We are here confronted with a philosophical anthropomorphism having nothing in common with Biblical anthropomorphism, for the Biblical theophanies, while showing us the acts and manifestations of the Personal God in the history of the world, and attributing some human traits to God thereby, also place us face to face with the mystery of His unknowable being, Whom Christians are still bold to venerate and to invoke, as the One unique being in Three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, who liveth and reigneth in the inaccessible light of his essence.

For us the Trinity remains the "*Deus absconditus*," the Holy of Holies of the divine existence; here no "strange

fire" may be introduced. Theology will be faithful to tradition, inasmuch as its technical terms serve to present more and more clearly the initial mystery of God the Trinity, without obscuring it with Trinitarian deductions derived from another standpoint. By defending the Personal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone, Orthodoxy makes a profession of faith in the "Simple Trinity" (τριὰς ἑπ' αὐτῇ) wherein the relations of origin denote the absolute diversity of the Three, while also indicating their unity, as represented by the Father, who is not simply a Monad but, in that he is the Father, is the *principle* of the Tri-unity. If God is the Living God of revelation, he can only be the Tri-une God, and he is the Living God before he is the simple essence of the philosophers. This is a primordial truth, incapable of being based on any process of reasoning whatever, because all reasoning, all truth, and all thought must be confessed to be posterior to the truth of the Living Tri-une God, the basis of all being and of all knowledge.

As we have seen, all Triadology depends on the question of the procession of the Holy Spirit:—

If the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, this ineffable procession confronts us with the absolute diversity of the Three Persons, by excluding *all relations of opposition*; if He proceeds from the Father and the Son, the relations of origin, instead of being signs of absolute diversity, become determinants of the Persons, from the starting-point of an impersonal principle.

If the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, as the Personal cause of the consubstantial Persons, this is the "Simple Trinity," where the monarchy of the Father conditions the Personal diversity of the Three, while also expressing their essential unity; the balance between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις is maintained. But if the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, as from one single *principle*, essential unity takes precedence of personal diversity and the Persons are relations of the essence, differentiated from one another by mutual *opposition*; this is no longer the "Simple Trinity"; the absolute simplicity of the essence is treated as an ontological basis, where there should be no basis except the primordial Trinity.

VII

By the dogma of the Filioque the God of the philosophers and savants is introduced into the place of the Living God, and takes the place of the "Deus Absconditus," "Quix posuit tenebras latibulum suum." The Unknowable Essence of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, receives positive qualifications. It becomes the subject of a Natural Theology, concerned with "God in general," Who may be the God of Descartes, or the God of Leibnitz, or even perhaps, to some extent, the God of Voltaire and the dechristianized Deists of the eighteenth century. The manuals of theology will begin with a demonstration of his existence, thence to deduce, from the simplicity of his essence, the mode in which the perfections found in creation are to be attributed to this eminently simple essence. From his attributes they will go on to a discussion of what he can or cannot do, if he is not to contradict himself, and is to remain true to his essential perfection. Later on, in a last chapter about the relations of the essence, which do not remove its simplicity, a fragile bridge between the God of the philosophers and the God of revelation will be built.

By the dogma of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone, the God of the philosophers is forever banished from the Holy of Holies, which is hid from the gaze of the Seraphim and is glorified through the Three Holinesses Who are gathered into a Single Sovereignty and Divinity.¹ The unnameable essence of the Trinity escapes all positive qualifications, including that of simplicity. If we say, "the Simple Trinity," that, self-contradictory expression only means that the distinctions between the Three Persons and one another and between Them and the essence introduce into the Trinity no division into constituent elements. Where the idea of the monarchy of the Father remains unshakable, no distinction postulated by faith can introduce synthesis into the Godhead.

Because God is unknowable in that which he is, Orthodox theology distinguishes between the essence of God and his energies, between the inaccessible nature of the Holy Trinity and the "natural processions" of God. When we speak of the Trinity, in Itself, we are confessing, in our poor and defective human language, the mode of existence of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, One only God, who cannot but be Triune, because he is the Living God of revelation,

¹ Greg. Naz. "On the Theophany." Or xxxviii, 8 P.G. xxxvi, 320B.

made known, although unknowable, through the incarnation of the Son to all who have received the Holy Spirit, Who proceeds from the Father and is sent into the world in the name of the Incarnate Son.

Every divine name, except the names of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, even the names of the Word and the Paraclete, is inappropriate as a designation of the special *characters* of the Persons in the inaccessible existence of the Trinity, and refers rather to the external aspect of God in his manifestation or economy. The dogma of the Trinity marks the summit of the mountain-top of theology, where our thought stands still before the initial mystery of the existence of the Personal God. Apart from the names denoting the Three persons and the common name of the Trinity, the other innumerable names given to God, the "divine names," which text-book theology calls his attributes, denotes not God in his inaccessible essence but God in that which surrounds his essence. (τὰ περὶ τῆς οὐσίας).³ This is the eternal radiance of the common content of the Three Persons, the radiance of Their incommunicable nature, revealed in the "energies." This technical term of Byzantine theology (ἐνέργεια) denoting a mode of divine existence beyond the essence of God, introduces no new philosophical notion alien to revelation. The Bible, in its concrete language, speaks of nothing other than "energies," when it tells us of the "Glory of God," a glory with innumerable names surrounding the inaccessible being of God, and making him known outside himself, while concealing what he is in himself. This is the eternal glory appertaining to the Three Persons, which the Son "had with the Father before the world was." And when we speak of this Glory in relation to the human beings to whom it is communicated and given, and by whom it is appropriated, this divine and uncreated reality within us is called Grace.

¹ Acts of the Councils of CP in 1341, Mansi xxv.

² It is thus that the Logos of the Prologue to St. John's Gospel signifies the Son, in that he *Manifests* the nature of the Father—the common nature of the Holy Trinity. In this sense, the Logos includes the Holy Spirit also in his manifesting role. "In him was life, and the life was the light of men."

³ Greg. Naz. "On the Theophany," Or. xxxviii, 7, P.G. xxxvi, 317B.

VIII

The manifesting energies of God, which denote a mode of divine existence other than that of the Trinity, in Itself, in God's incommunicable nature, do not make a breach in the divine unity; they do not abolish the "Simple Trinity." The same monarchy of the Father, Who is the cause of the consubstantial Persons of the Son and the Holy Spirit, also presides over the manifestation, *ad extra*, of the unity of the Trinity. [*Here the term causality, as applied to the Father, in that he is the *principle* of the absolute diversities of the Three Consubstantial Persons (a term implying the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone) must be clearly distinguished from the *revelation* or manifestation of the Father by the Son in the Holy Spirit. Causality, with all its defects as a term, expresses what it stands for quite well; it represents the personal distinction between the Three, as regarded from the starting-point of the Person of the Father, a distinction between absolute diversities, determined by the fact that the Father is not merely the essence. It is not possible to replace the conventional term *causality* by the term *manifestation* (of the Father),¹ without confounding the two planes of thought, that of the self-existence of the Trinity, and that of existence "ad extra" in the radiance of the essential glory of God.*]

If the Father is the Personal cause of the Persons, he is also, by that, the *principle* of their possession of the same nature; in that sense, he is the source of the common Godhead of the Three. The revelation of this nature, the externalization of the unknowable essence of the Three, is not a reality which is strange to the Three Persons. All energy, and all manifestations, comes from the Father, is expressed in the Son, and goes forth "ad extra" in the Holy Spirit.² This procession, appertaining to the Godhead, manifesting and *energetic*, must be clearly distinguished from the Personal procession, which is internal and is from the Father alone. The same monarchy of the Father conditions both the Personal procession of the Holy Spirit (his Personal existence

*The passages between asterisks were not read at Oxford. Translator.

¹ As Fr. Bulgakov tried to do in his book, *The Paraclete*. A French translation, *Paraclet*, is published by Aubier, 1942.

² Thus all the divine names, denoting as they do the common nature, can be applied to each of the Persons, but only in the *energetic* order, that of the Manifestation of the Godhead. Vide e.g. Greg. Nys. "Against the Macedonians" 13. "The source of power is the Father; the power is the Son; the spirit of power is the Holy Spirit," P.G. xlvi, 1317. Greg. Naz. Or. xxiii, 11 "The True, the Truth, the Spirit of Truth."

ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Πατρὸς) and the manifesting natural procession of the common Godhead "ad extra" in the Holy Spirit, through the Son (διὰ Υἱοῦ).

[*If, as we have already said, the name "Holy Spirit" stands for a divine economy rather than for a personal *character*, that means that the Third Person is *par excellence* the Person of manifestation, the Person in Whom we know God the Trinity. His Person is hidden from us by the very profusion of the Godhead manifested by Him. It is this personal kenosis of the Holy Spirit on the plane of manifestation and economy which makes it hard to grasp His hypostatic existence. The same plane of natural manifestation gives significance to the name of "The Logos," as applied to the Son. The Logos is "a concise declaration of the nature of the Father," as St. Gregory Nazianzus says.¹ When St. Basil speaks to us of the Son who "shows us in himself the whole of the Father, shining with all His glory in resplendence,"² he is concerned with the manifesting and *energetic* aspect of the Trinity. Likewise all the Patristic loci in which the Son is called "the image of the Father" and the Holy Spirit is called "the image of the Son" are to be regarded as allusions to the manifesting or *energetic* aspect of the Trinity.³ The Son is not the Father, but is what the Father is; the Holy Spirit is not the Son, but is what the Son is.⁴ In the order of the divine manifestation, the hypostases are not images of the personal diversities, but are images of the common nature; the Father reveals his nature through the Son, and the Godhead of the Son is manifested in the Holy Spirit. That is the reason why in the order of the divine manifestation, as considered in theology, it is possible to establish the order of the Persons (τάξις) which strictly speaking should not be attributed to the self-existence of the Trinity, despite the *monarchy* and *causality* of the Father (since these confer upon him no personal primacy over the other two Persons as he is a Person only in that the Son and the Holy Spirit are also Persons.*)]

¹ Or. xxx, *Theologica* iv, 20. P.G. xxxvi, 129A.

² "Against Eunomius," ii, 17. P.G. xxiv, 605B.

³ Cyr. Alex. Thesaurus assert. xxxiii, P.G. lxxv, 572.

⁴ An. Dam, "Concerning Images," iii, 18, "On the Faith," i, 13, P.G. xlvii, 856.

⁵ Greg. Naz. Or. xxxi, *Theologica* v, 9. P.G. xxxvi, 144A.

IX

[*The self-existence of the Trinity and the *energetic* self-revelation of God (or Personal Causality and Natural Manifestation) can be confounded in two different and, in a certain sense, opposite ways. Firstly, the Trinity may be conceived as an internal revelation of the divine nature in notional acts; the Father expresses his nature in the Word and the Two make the Holy Spirit proceed as the mutual "bond of love" between Them. This is the Triadology of Latin Filioquism. Secondly, the Trinity may be conceived as an internal revelation of the Persons or of the "Tri-hypostatic subject" in the common nature. That is the Triadology of Russian Sophianism, particularly in Fr. Bulgakov. In both cases, the equilibrium between essence and persons is broken, in favour of the essence (with the Latins) or in favour of the hypostasis (with the Sophians).*]

The distinction between the unknowable essence of the Trinity and the *energetic* processions, clearly defined by the great councils of the fourteenth century, allows Orthodox theology to maintain firmly the difference between Tri-hypostatic self-existence and Tri-hypostatic existence in the common manifestation, beyond the essence. In his hypostatic existence, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone; this ineffable procession enable us to confess the absolute diversity of the Three Persons, i.e. our faith in the Holy Tri-unity. In the order of manifestation, in revealing the divine nature, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son (διὰ Υἱοῦ) after the Word, and that procession reveals to us the common glory of the Three, the eternal splendour of the Godhead.

It is curious to notice that the distinction between the Personal existence of the Holy Spirit, proceeding from the Father alone, and his eternal radiance, εἰς αἰδίου ἐκφανσιν, through the Son, was formulated in the course of the discussions which took place in Constantinople towards the end of the thirteenth century, after the Council of Lyons.¹ The continuity of doctrinal teaching can be realized here; the defence of the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father alone necessitates a decision as to the import of the phrase, διὰ Υἱοῦ; this in turn opens the way for the definition of the distinction between the essence and the energies. This is not a "dogmatic development"; a

¹ George of Cyprus in P.G. cxlii, 360. See Lebedev's *Troitsky*, for the theological discussions at the end of the thirteenth century.

single identical tradition is defended, at different points, by the Orthodox from St. Photios to George of Cyprus and St. Gregory Palamas.

It would not be exact to say, as some Orthodox polemical writers have sometimes said, that the procession διὰ Υἱου signifies solely the temporal mission of the Holy Spirit. In the case of the temporal mission of the Persons of the Son and the Holy Spirit a new factor is involved, that of will. This will, as we know, can only be the Common Will of the Trinity. The Temporal Mission is a special case of the Divine Economic Manifestation, in relation to creation. Generally speaking, the divine economy in time expresses the eternal manifestation, but the eternal manifestation is not necessarily the basis of created beings, which *could have not existed*. Independently of the existence of the creatures, the Trinity is manifested in the radiance of his glory. From all eternity, the Father is the Father of glory, the Word is the brightness of his glory, and the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of glory (Eph. i, 17; Heb. i, 3; I Peter iv, 14).

The poverty of human language sometimes makes it hard to see whether it is the *Personal procession* or the *procession of manifestation* to which a writer is alluding; both are eternal, although with different relationships. Very often the Fathers simultaneously employ expressions relating to the Personal existence of the Holy Spirit and to the eternal manifestation of the divine nature in the Holy Spirit, even when defining his Personal *character*, or distinguishing him from the other Persons. Nevertheless, they well distinguished between the two modes of existence, that of Personal subsistence and that of manifestation. In evidence, we can cite this passage from St. Basil: "From the Father proceeds the Son, through Whom are all things, and with Whom the Holy Spirit is ever inseparably known, for none can think of the Son without being enlightened by the Spirit; thus the Holy Spirit, the source of all good distributed to created beings, is linked to the Son, with Whom He is inseparably conceived, and his being is dependent on the Father, from Whom he proceeds. Therefore the characteristic mark of his Personal separateness is to be *manifested* after the Son and with him, and to *subsist* proceeding from the Father."¹ Many other Patristic texts can be cited, in which the writer is concerned simultaneously with the eternal manifestation of the Godhead in the Holy

¹ P.G. xxxviii (alias xliii, 4. P.G. xxxii, 329C-32A. See also Greg. Nyss. "Against Eunomius," i. P.G. xlv 369 and 416C.

Spirit, and with his Personal existence.¹ It was on the basis of those texts that the Latinizing Greeks sought to defend the Personal procession of the Holy Spirit, through the Son," and thereby to reconcile the two different Triadologies.

X

It is easy to conceive the difficulties which the distinction between the Personal existence of the Holy Spirit and the eternal manifestation of the Godhead in his Person presented to the theologically uncultured intelligences of Western Christians of the Carolingian period. It may well be supposed that it was the truth of the eternal manifestation which the first Filioquist formulas, in Spain and elsewhere before the ninth century, were intended to express. It is possible that the Filioquism of St. Augustine can also be interpreted in that sense, although there the problem is more difficult and a theological analysis of the treatise, *De Trinitate*, is needed. Until now no such an analysis has been made by the Orthodox. Filioquism as a doctrine of the Personal procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, *as from one principle*, reached its clear, definite, and explicit form in the great centuries of scholasticism. After the Councils of Lyons and Florence, it was no longer possible to interpret the Latin formula in the sense of the eternal manifestation of the Godhead. It also became impossible for Roman Catholic theologians to admit the existence of the *energetic* manifestation of the Trinity, as something not contradicting the truth of the divine simplicity. In the West, there was no longer any place for the conception of the energies of the Trinity; nothing was admitted to exist, outside the divine essence except created effects, acts of will analogous to the act of creation. Western theologians must profess belief in the created character of the Glory of God and of sanctifying Grace and renounce the conception of deification or theosis. In this they are consistent with their Triadological premises.

Reconciliation will be possible and the Filioque will no longer be an "impedimentum diremens" at the moment when the West, which has been frozen for so long in dogmatic isolation, shall cease to consider Byzantine theology as an absurd innovation and shall recognize that it only

¹ E.G. The Formula concerning the Spirit in the Synodikon of St. Tarasius, read at the seventh council, in which the distinction between the plane of subsistence and that of eternal manifestation is not noticed. Mansi xii, 1122.

expressed traditional truth, to be found in a less explicit form in the Fathers of the first ages of the Church. It will then be recognized that what may seem absurd from the point of view of a theology in which faith seeks understanding are not so absurd for an understanding which is open to the full reception of revelation and to the acquirement of "the sense of the Scriptures," whose sacred words were, of old time, "foolishness," to the Greek philosophers. The Greeks have ceased to be Greeks, in becoming Sons of the Church; that is why they have given to the Christian faith its imperishable theological armoury. May the Latins in their turn cease to be solely Latins in their theology. Then we shall with one mind confess our common Catholic faith in the Holy Trinity, who liveth and reigneth in the inapproachable light of his glory.

VLADIMIR LOSSKY

(TRANSLATION BY EDWARD EVERY).

The Holy Spirit in Christian Initiation

(1) THE SEAL OF THE COVENANT

NEARLY sixty years ago a book was published, entitled *The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*. In it the author, Dr. A. J. Mason, showed that according to the teaching of the early Christian Fathers the Holy Spirit is given to the Christian neophyte, not in the waters of baptism, but solely in the rite which the West now calls confirmation. The conclusions of this book have never been seriously challenged; and today they are corroborated by fresh lines of investigation. The new factors which have emerged are of two kinds. First there is the discovery of material which throws new light upon the earliest phases of Christian liturgical development. Secondly there is the growing recognition that the Jewish background of Christian institutions is all important. A third factor is beginning to appear in a change of theological outlook with regard to the Old Testament. The scope of the present paper will be primarily biblical inasmuch as recent discussions concerning the theology of Christian initiation have so far paid very little attention to this part of the subject. Our method of approach, however, will carry the proviso that

Scripture and Tradition are organically one, and that consequently the teaching of the former cannot be safely elucidated except upon presuppositions of faith drawn from the latter. It will be assumed that the two covenants belong to a single divine plan in which Christ and his Church are seen to be the true Israel of God ; and again, that the apostolic tradition has an extended range which carries back its roots into old Israel, and an abiding character which carries forward its structure unimpaired into the future. We shall, therefore, look for a general pattern running through the whole story of the *ecclesia* in its earlier and in its later phases.

Attention has recently been paid to the Jewish rites for receiving a Gentile proselyte ; and a connexion has now been made out between this Jewish procedure and the earliest Christian rites of initiation as practised in Syria.¹ It is becoming clear that the earliest forms of Christian initiation followed the Jewish order, that is, first circumcision and then baptism with water. In the Syrian form circumcision was replaced by oil poured upon the head of the neophyte by the bishop. Moreover, it is noticeable that this double rite, as administered, would naturally be described as a "baptism"—a baptism first in oil and then in water. When the chrism was transferred to the end of the rites another form of symbolism was introduced, namely the application of the bishop's thumb to the neophyte's forehead. We shall have to look for the origin of this symbolism in the biblical background. The conception of this whole complex of rites as a "baptism" continued through the patristic period, and may probably have to be read back into the New Testament, so that, for example, the dominical formula at the end of St. Matthew's Gospel would include chrismation as well as water-baptism. This question of nomenclature, however, is perplexing, witness the early application of the "seal" terminology to the water of baptism, or indeed to any of the principal stages in the complex of rites. In that way the gift of the Spirit might even be verbally distinguished from "the seal" (Dix, *op. cit.*, p. 3). This fluctuation may well be due to a typically Semitic idiom of thought, whereby two objects, closely associated, are alternately identified and distinguished. If so it would be precarious to argue from such details to any particular theological conclusion. It is only by a searching

¹ Gavin—*The Jewish antecedents to the Christian Sacraments* (S.P.C.K. 1928) ; G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, Vol. I, pp. 331-5 (Harvard, fourth impr. 1944) ; Dix, *Confirmation, or Laying on of Hands?* (S.P.C.K. 1936).

survey of the evidence that we may hope to unravel these complications.

Here we must take note of a factor in the psychology of language closely akin to what has just been said. When a word has two distinct meanings, thought may easily pass over from one to the other. Thus, the traditional phraseology about "the seal of the Spirit" has its roots in at least two different scriptural images; and each of these in turn may have more than one application. A seal may be used to attest a document, or again to secure the safety of valuables. A document may be sealed to give it validity or sealed up to keep it secret. On the other hand the two uses have something in common. In ancient times the royal seal gave authority to a proclamation, and it might also mark particular objects as property of "the Crown"; in both cases it transmitted the aura of majesty to a concrete object. Again, in Rom. xv, 28, St. Paul describes the completion of his mission to Jerusalem with the collection for the poor saints as "having sealed up this fruit for them." For in the business of a fruit-farm the sealing up of the fruit in bags for dispatch and sale was the last of a whole series of operations which began with the planting of the trees. "Sealing" here means "completion"; and we can understand how, with this idiom of thought, the "sealing" of the neophyte's brow with chrism by the bishop's thumb would come appropriately at the end of the baptismal rites.

There is the same nuance of completion in St. Paul's reference to the circumcision of Abraham as a "seal" affixed to the covenant (Rom. iv, 11). The relation of the circumcision-seal to the covenant-status of "righteousness by faith," previously inaugurated, bears a certain analogy to the relation of a signature-seal to the substance of the document which it validates. Indeed the analogy must have suggested itself to the apostle. He may even have had in mind the great scene where the covenant was renewed by Israel after the Exile. In the ninth chapter of Nehemiah the solemn recital of the covenant history begins with its inauguration in the story of Abraham and ends with the renewed sealing of the covenant in writing by the heads of the post-exilic community. As the covenant was originally sealed in the flesh of Abraham by circumcision, so its renewal was sealed once more in a written document. This line of thought was already present in the apostle's mind when he wrote a slightly earlier epistle which is now known to us

under the title: "II Corinthians." There he likened the Christian covenant to a writing upon human hearts in accordance with Jeremiah's prophecy (II Cor. iii, 3; Jer. xxxi, 33). The divine signature to the covenant was originally signed and sealed upon Abraham's flesh. The second edition of the covenant, under Moses, was written by the finger of God upon tables of stone. Finally the new covenant was once more written upon human flesh "by the Spirit of the living God."

Before we go further into the biblical theology of our subject a few words must be said here about the biblical use of imagery, instances of which have already been given. The Hebrew mind did not think along logical lines, as we understand logic. The pillars upon which the biblical chain of thought rests are not abstract propositions but concrete images, one image suggesting another, as we have already noted, sometimes through purely verbal associations. Any such image, however, can have only a limited reference; and no single image, drawn from the Old Testament, could correspond adequately to that fulfilment of all scriptural images which has taken place in Christ. Adam was a "type of him that was to come," partly because he was, in certain respects, the very opposite of his antitype. This illustration comes from a section of Romans (v. 12ff) which follows immediately upon the argument about Abraham's justification. Similarly, in that argument circumcision is depreciated, but in such a way as to remind us that, although it is a symbol of all that we have left behind, it is also a type of what the apostle elsewhere calls the "circumcision not made with hands" (Col. ii, 11). The seal of the old covenant proved to be of transitory significance by contrast with the substance of the document. Yet when that substance, "the righteousness of faith"—fulfilled in Christ (Rom. x, 4-11), was re-written by the Spirit of God upon human hearts it received a new "seal of the Spirit," of which Jewish circumcision was the foreshadowing type.

(2) JESUS AND JOSHUA

Here another difficulty presents itself. If we accept the analogy between Jewish and Christian initiation what are we to make of the *reversal of order* by which circumcision + baptism for the proselyte to Judaism was eventually changed into baptism + chrism (or confirmation) for the Christian neophyte? We might also ask which order is

presupposed in the New Testament; and to this question, I think, no certain answer can be given. On the whole, one may perhaps venture to affirm that the writers of the New Testament were acquainted with a Christian usage which followed the Jewish order. On the other hand, we may also conclude with some confidence that the reversal of that order was an inevitable consequence of the new revelation in Christ, and that the evidence for this also lies within the New Testament. Of the new factors the most important would probably be the traditional account of our Lord's own baptism by John in the river Jordan, as handed down in the apostolic tradition (Acts i, 21, 22), and as recorded eventually in the four gospels.

The three synoptic evangelists are unanimous in their testimony as to the order of events on that occasion. St. Matthew and St. Mark explicitly affirm that the descent of the Spirit took place when Jesus "went up" or "was going up" out of the water; and St. Luke's account is consistent with this. Moreover St. Matthew brings out the inner significance of this order. Jesus condescended to share in the baptism of repentance in order "to fulfil all righteousness." He accepted the vocation of the Righteous Servant who identifies himself with sinners. In so doing he united the messianic destiny with the mission of the divine Victim and prepared himself to receive that outpouring of the Spirit which belongs to the Last Times. St. Luke emphasizes this in another way by introducing the sermon of the Anointed Servant at Nazareth almost immediately afterwards, while all three synoptists show the anointing with the Spirit to be a prelude to conflict, a challenge to the old serpent. There is also another point to be born in mind. According to the ritual directions in Exodus and Leviticus washing, robing and anointing were the characteristic rites by which the high-priesthood was inaugurated. These corresponded to the still more antique ceremonies connected with ancient kingship, itself a priestly office. In the messianic fulfilment our Lord entered his people's bath of purification and was anointed to be their Saviour. Yet he needed no purification for himself; and so from the first moment of his conception he was clothed with the overshadowing presence of the Spirit, as with a royal robe (Luke i, 35). This garment of the Spirit became visible on the Mount of Transfiguration in radiance and in cloud, when the voice of the Father acknowledged his beloved Son. So too, the

promise of the risen Christ. "Ye shall be clothed with power from on high" (Luke xxiv, 49), makes Pentecost to be a robing of the Church with the Spirit. But if the Shekinah-cloud covers the tabernacle, it also penetrates within; and by another Hebrew idiom the Spirit clothes himself with the flesh of his servants.

In a Jewish Targum upon Exodus it is said that the prophet Elijah "will restore the flask of oil which existed from the days of the wilderness." Elijah is here called "the chief-priest"; and this indicates an expectation that Elijah will anoint Messias as Zadok anointed Solomon, and with the same flask of oil.¹ To this expectation there corresponds a Christian tradition that St. John Baptist laid his hand upon our Lord's head in the River Jordan; and again in primitive Christian practice there was an "imposition of the baptizer's hand on the neophyte's head at the moment of immersion" (Dix, *op. cit.*, p. 5, note 2). We may, perhaps, connect these details with the early Syrian practice by which the bishop's hand was placed upon the head when he gave the pre-baptismal unction. After the change of order this rite of χειροθεσία re-appears in Tertullian's account as the last item in the ceremonies of Christian initiation and as the means through which the Holy Spirit is invoked. In such congruities we have hints of a single pattern, in which, with other details, elements of the priest-king ritual enter into the baptismal symbolism of the Church.² The Gospel narratives suggest that this ancient ritual provides an external link between our Lord's baptism (with its Old Testament background) and the corresponding mysteries of Christian initiation.

We have suggested a continuity between Christian baptismal rites and the descent of Jesus into the River Jordan. We have now to trace a connexion between this same event and the idea of a new circumcision. For this purpose a document of outstanding interest is the *Dialogue* of St. Justin Martyr *with Trypho* which contains clues of major importance. These clues could scarcely become evident, however, until the recent elucidation of the Jewish background had taken place, showing a correspondence between the seal of the Spirit

¹ I owe this reference to the English version of Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* by Lukyn Williams, p. 18, note 6 (S.P.C.K. 1930). Cp. *Dialogue*, chs. viii and xlix.

² See also Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Catechism*, notes on pp. 83, 86 (Cambridge, 1940).

in chrism and the Jewish rite of circumcision. In Justin's *Dialogue* the connexion emerges with the introduction of Joshua's name. Every Christian reader of the Septuagint knew Joshua, the conqueror of Canaan, under the name of Jesus. The story of Jesus-Joshua, the successor of Moses, would from the first be read as showing how Jesus Christ, the all-sufficient successor of Moses, had become "the mediator of a better covenant" (cp. Acts vii, 45; Heb. iv, 8 ff). Justin, however, is apparently the first Christian writer known to us who fastens upon the incident of the "second circumcision (Joshua v, 2ff).¹ It is recorded that immediately after the miraculous crossing of the Jordan Joshua was directed to make "knives of flint, and circumcise the children of Israel again the second time"; and Joshua did so.

The scriptural narrative explains that the older generation of Israel had been circumcised in Egypt. But all these (save Joshua and Caleb) had died; and their children were as yet uncircumcised. These were "the little ones" (Num. xiv, 31) who, unlike their rebellious parents, were to inherit the land. As such they were types of new-born Christians. So first, they passed through Jordan with "Jesus" leading the way, and then they were circumcised by "Jesus." In this fashion they entered the land "flowing with milk and honey" (verse 6). Thereafter, according to the Septuagint, "they had peace, sitting there in the camp until, they became well" (verse 8). Can we not see the Christian neophytes who had passed through Jordan's waters in baptism, and who had received from the bishop the seal of the new circumcision and the kiss of peace, taking their places in the congregation of the new Israel, and thus, cured of sin's sickness, entering upon the way of health and wholeness in which salvation consists? But the analogy continues. For next "the children of Israel kept the passover"; and in the new Israel the paschal liturgy of Easter followed upon the admission of new members to the Church. There are others points of coincidence. In the Joshua narrative, for example, the whole of verses 10-12 might seem to carry a eucharistic reference. The typology, however, gains in significance if in Justin's time the new circumcision of the Spirit followed upon the baptism of water; and the *Dialogue* contains evidence that this was actually the case. Quoting Jeremiah on the "broken vessels" of Judaism this father bids the Jews return to the

¹ *Dialogue*, chs. xii, xxiv, cxiii.

fount of life. "God commands you to wash in this laver and to be circumcised with the true circumcision."¹

St. Justin is, therefore a link between the record of our Lord's baptism in "the Memoirs of the Apostles" and the rites of Christian initiation as they appear, half a century later, in *The Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus. Once more Christ and the Church are united in a single mystery. The passage of Israel through Jordan with Jesus-Joshua caused the hearts of the kings to melt, "neither was there spirit in them any more" (Joshua v, 1). So the new Israel descends with Jesus Christ into the waters of the new creation to share with him in his victorious mission, whereat "kings shall shut their mouths" (Is. lii, 15). Similarly the "second circumcision" is our participation in that original messianic outpouring, when the Spirit descended upon Jesus "as a dove"—the Dove who brings peace and health to our nature, equipping us for the conflict whereby the land of promise is re-won.

(3) THE HEART AND THE HEAD

In his final exposition of Joshua's "second circumcision" Justin explains that the "knives of flint" are the words of Christ which effect "the circumcision of the heart" (*Dialogue*, ch. cxiii). The phrase takes us back to those texts of Deuteronomy upon which the prophets, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, would appear to have based some of their teaching. Also, the various statements by Justin concerning the new circumcision start from an appeal to the well-known passage in Jeremiah:

I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt . . . this is the covenant that I will make . . . I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it (Jer. xxxi, 31-33).²

In the Hebrew idiom "to make a covenant" is "to *cut* a covenant"; and this might suggest a surgical operation such as is im-

¹ *Dialogue*, ch. xviii, where the "laver" comes from Is. i, 16; ch. xix. repeats the injunction in terms of Jer. ii, 13 and *in the same order*.

² In ch. xi, Justin quotes part of Jer. xxxi, 31 ff; and in ch. xii, after referring to Jeremiah's "cry," he declares that "a second circumcision is now necessary," thus connecting the prophet with the Joshua typology, as in ch. cxiii he connects both with Deuteronomy.

plied in the literal meaning of the Deuteronomic texts. Moreover the prophets evidently took very seriously both halves of the statement in Deut. xxx, 6: "The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart . . . to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart." Nothing short of an act of God could produce such a result; and for Jeremiah, accordingly, this teaching pointed forward to a covenant quite different in character from that of Sinai-Horeb. A like difference between the two covenants is expressed by St. Paul, partly in the contrast between tablets of stone and hearts of flesh, and partly in a contrast between two circumcisions, the one outward "in the flesh," the other "of the heart in the Spirit." In the last verse of Rom. ii he seems to blend the two figures of speech. As the Jewish boy came under the dispensation of the Law through his circumcision, so for Christians there is an act of new circumcision by which the sword of the Spirit cuts into the heart, and, like a pen, writes upon or in it the new law of Christ.

In the *Dialogue with Trypho* Justin's use of the prophet Jeremiah appears to correspond closely with St. Paul's; it may, therefore, serve as a pointer to the apostle's movement of thought. There is a common starting point in the "new covenant" prophecy; and then Justin takes us back to earlier statements of the prophet about circumcision which are appropriate to the apostle's argument (*Dialogue*, ch. xxviii).¹ In the first of these (Jer. iv, 3, 4) the circumcision of the heart is compared to the breaking up of fallow ground. The Septuagint rendering here might carry for Christians a suggestion of the "new creation" doctrine (νέωσατε ἑαυτοὺς νεώματα), especially as the Jews have just been urged to become Christian proselytes (i.e. "new-born children") before it is too late. All this fits the argument of II Cor. iii-vi. The second passage (Jer. ix, 24, 25) refers to those who are "circumcised in their uncircumcision" and contains in germ the argument developed by St. Paul at the end of Rom. ii.² Ezek. xlv, 7-9 has a similar combination. But we have now to notice other striking developments of Jeremiah's thought in his younger contemporary. Ezek. xi, 19 elaborates Jeremiah's agricultural-cum-surgical metaphor. The fallow ground contains stones which must be dug up. So

¹ *Dialogue*, ch. xxiii may have an echo of Rom. iv, 11.

² LXX alters the argument here, but introduces in ix, 26 the contrast between "flesh" and "heart" which we have already noticed in Rom. ii, 28, 29.

the promise of the Spirit carries with it a removal of the stony heart out of the flesh that the heart may be all flesh. This contrast corresponds to II Corinthians rather than to Romans.¹ In Ezek. xxxvi, 25-7 we have the fullest statement of this kind; and a comparison with St. Paul shows parallels in a curiously chronological sequence:

EZEK. xxxvi, 25-7	ST. PAUL
(1) I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness . . . will I cleanse you.	In one Spirit were we all baptized into one body . . . and we were all imbued with one Spirit (I Cor. xii, 13).
(2) (a) A new heart also will I give you, and a new Spirit will I put within you;	Ye are an epistle of Christ, written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God,
(b) and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. ²	not in tables of stone, but in tables that are hearts of flesh (II Cor. iii, 3).
(3) And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgements and do them.	. . . that the righteous ordinance of the law might be fulfilled in us . . . So surely as the Spirit of God dwelleth in you (Rom. viii, 4, 9).

In view of what was said above as to a blending of two figures of speech in Rom. ii, 29, it may be suggested that Ezek. xxxvi, would naturally be understood to foreshadow a threefold pattern of initiation consisting of water-baptism, circumcision of the heart, and an indwelling of the Spirit. This in turn corresponds broadly to the main lines of liturgical development, provided that the new circumcision is identified with the imposition of the chrism over which the bishop has invoked the divine blessing.

The operation which effects a writing upon the heart is an invisible and mystical act of God. For that reason it is appropriately called a "circumcision not made with hands" (Col. ii, 11). Nevertheless it is mediated sacramentally by a sealing of the brow; and for this also there is scriptural precedent. The prophet Ezekiel had, in one of the earlier

¹ i.e. "heart" and "flesh" are not contrasted but identified.

² This verse provided the scriptural foundation for the rabbinical comparison of the evil impulse with "stone"; it was also taken as a promise that the evil impulse would be eradicated in the Age to Come (Moore, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 493). A Christian counterpart of this doctrine would be the removal of *reatus originalis* by baptismal grace.

incidents of his book, seen an angel making a mark upon the foreheads of the faithful Israelites, thus separating them from the idolators that they might escape the impending judgment (Ezek. ix, 4, 6). The mark in question was the last letter of the Hebrew alphabet, the *Tau*; and in the old script it was shaped like a St. Andrew's Cross (×), a fact which was known to the early Church. According to Jewish tradition the mark was made in ink from the ink-horn which the angel carried. It corresponded, however, to the mark made in blood upon the lintels of the Israelite houses on the night of the Exodus from Egypt. The conjunction of these two Old Testament types in the Revelation of St. John should have relieved the modern commentators of some at least of their perplexities with regard to the sealing of the 144,000 "servants of God upon their foreheads" (Rev. vii, 2-8). Here the sealing takes place between two groups of plagues (recorded in chapters vi and viii). Similarly in Exodus the blood is placed on the lintels after the first nine plagues and before the final plague with its hazardous sequel. The 144,000, therefore, are the new Israel; and their sealing upon the forehead secures to each and all of them their participation in the new Exodus. There is a third element in the picture, however, beside those which come from Exodus and Ezekiel. This is the incident which gives its name to the book of Numbers. The numbering of the twelve tribes at the beginning of that book concludes significantly with the threefold Aaronic blessing and the words: "So shall they put my Name upon the children of Israel" (Num. vi, 22-7). So throughout the Revelation of St. John the seal takes the form of the divine name written upon the forehead.

In Exod. xxviii, 9-12, it is enjoined that the high-priest shall bear on his shoulders two stones engraved with the names of the twelve tribes, "like the engravings of a signet." Under the new covenant there is a complementary engraving, also like that of a signet-seal. The name of the divine priest-victim is added to that of his Father upon the forehead of each member of the new Israel (Rev. xiv, 1; Cp. iii, 12, xxii, 3, 4). This further detail from the book of Exodus would perhaps blend the more easily with the picture in Ezekiel, since the mark of the *Tau* seen by the prophet on the foreheads of the faithful was also familiar as a signature-mark, used like a signet-seal to attest a document (cp. Job xxxi, 5 and the comment upon this verse by G. A. Cooke in his

commentary on Ezek. ix, 4, p. 106 in the I.C.C.). If these literary connexions be accepted the seal in the Apocalypse would have the same two aspects which are familiar elsewhere in Scripture. It would designate the faithful to be the property of God and the Lamb. It would also exhibit them as written documents attested by the divine signature.

(4) THE CHRISM, THE SEAL, AND THE GIFT

In Job iv, 19 human bodies are called "houses of clay"; and the implicit reference to Gen. ii, 7 is accentuated in the Septuagint.¹ This characteristic biblical idiom would doubtless enable Justin to see in the Israelite houses of Exod. xii the bodies of the Christian neophytes, who "anoint their own houses, that is themselves" with the blood of Christ.² There follows an almost cryptic explanation which (he says) "all can understand," namely, that "the plasm of which God moulded Adam became a house of the inbreathing." So abrupt a transition from the Exodus to the creation of Adam would become intelligible to "all" if the mind passed from the preliminary self-baptism or self-anointing (a thoroughly archaic conception; cp. I Cor. vi, 11) to the plasmic act of the bishop's thumb upon the chrism as the means through which once more God breathes the divine Spirit-Breath into our newly-created nature. Justin's language in this passage may well imply a pre-baptismal unction (besides the chrism), as we have it in Hippolytus. In any case his merging of Old Testament types here and elsewhere implies, not only a close conjunction of anointing with sealing,³ but also a repetition of Adam's creation in the initiation of Christians. Every chrismation is also a plasmation; and this in turn corresponds to our Lord's method of healing the blind man in John ix, and to the liturgical relevance of that incident in relation to Christian baptism.⁴ There is a similar collocation of types in the Johannine interpretation of our Lord's baptism. For there the paschal Lamb who is to shed his blood receives the Spirit. The Dove descends,

¹ Where, in the context (iv, 21), the divine breath destroys, as in Genesis it created life.

² *Dialogue*, ch. xl. Cp. ch. xxiv, where for those who "have put their faith in the saving blood," the blood of circumcision is obsolete, being replaced by the second circumcision of Jesus as indicated in Joshua v.

³ In *Dialogue*, ch. iii, the blood-mark of Exod. xii is assumed to be in the form of a cross (i.e. Tau). See the editorial notes of Otto and Lukyn Williams *ad. loc.*

⁴ On which see Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, pp. 419 ff.

not upon the waters of the first creation, but upon the Adam of the new creation (John i, 32). It seems that it is this incident which is afterwards referred to at Capernaum in terms of the seal, where Jesus is designated as he whom "the Father, even God did seal" (vi, 27), that is, with the Spirit-breath of the new creation. By this act God attested the Son of Man (vi, 27) to be his Only Son (i, 34); and the Baptist, by his acceptance of our Lord's claim, added his own signature-mark to the divine attestation (iii, 33).¹

A like concentration of typology, with corresponding Christological significance, is to be seen in II Cor. i, 18-22. One of the most important passages for our present argument. Here our Lord is called "the Yea" and "the Amen" because all the promises of God are fulfilled in him; and this is the necessary clue to a right understanding of the great phrases piled up in the conclusion of the passage. Here, so, we have "anointing" and "sealing" closely joined, with a concluding reference to the gift of "the Spirit in our hearts." In this passage St. Paul is defending the motives of himself and his fellow-missionaries. To them the repeated use of the word "us" refers. But at the conclusion, in verse 22, "us" is joined with "you" as though to associate the apostolic ministry with the Corinthian Christians in the anointing and sealing, as also in the gift of the Spirit. I shall mention presently further reasons for this interpretation. Meanwhile, upon this view, the pregnant meaning of verse 22 can best be brought out in paraphrase after some such fashion as this: "The God who anointed his Son (cp. verse 19) now establishes us with you in the life of his Anointed One. As he anointed and sealed the Messiah at his baptism, so also he anointed and sealed us in our baptism. He then gave to us also the 'earnest' or first instalment of the Spirit in our hearts; and in all these privileges you also have a share." In this paraphrase "baptism" has the exclusive connotation common to the ancient church.

The interpretation which I have given to "us with you" corresponds to "we all with unveiled face" at the end of chapter iii in this epistle, and also to the saying in II Timothy about "the crown which the Lord will give to me . . . and

¹ Even this does not exhaust the typology. For here, as elsewhere in N.T. the New Adam is also the Davidic Messiah, as well as the Servant. Moreover "Son of Man" would carry a double reference (a) to Adam (Gen. i, viii) and (b) to the Messiah (Enoch). Dan. vii, in which the Man of Law receives his rule over the Beasts (Gen. ii) mediates between (a) and (b).

not only to me, but also to all them that love his appearing" (II Tim. iv, 8). But even if the anointing and sealing of our text refers exclusively to the apostolic ministers, it must still refer, not to their ministerial *charismata* as such, but to those gifts which they in common with all other neophytes received in their initiation as Christians. The reason for this conclusion lies in the final phrase of the text, namely "the *arrabon* of the Spirit." The metaphor of "earnest-money" or "first instalment" is clearly established for this phrase. The *arrabon* of the Spirit is that gift of the Spirit which all Christians receive by their initiation into the life in Christ, the first instalment of their share in our Lord's own messianic endowment. The phrase occurs again in this same epistle (II Cor. v, 5) near the conclusion of the argument to which the earlier use of the phrase is by way of prelude. The chapters which lie between give a very clear indication of the context to which the *arrabon* of the Spirit belongs. In those intervening chapters the apostle is expounding the life in Christ in its relevance both to himself and to his readers. This section includes the writing of the Spirit upon the hearts of his readers, and also the daily dying of the apostle with Christ and his hope of resurrection. The argument concludes by connecting the hope of resurrection with the *arrabon* of the Spirit. For this preliminary gift of the Spirit received at his initiation was, for St. Paul as for his fellow Christians, the sowing of a seed which is to bear fruit in the resurrection of the body.

The seed-and-harvest analogy, originally developed by the apostle in his exposition of the general resurrection (I Cor. xv), later serves to connect the *arrabon* of the Spirit with the risen Lord. In Rom. viii, 10-23 the doctrines of I and II Corinthians are brought together. As Jesus is the "firstfruit" of the resurrection harvest so we who have "the firstfruit of the Spirit" are already in process towards that final harvest of the Spirit which will be gathered in the final resurrection. Thus the *arrabon* of the Spirit which was first bestowed in the anointing and sealing of the newly-baptized has an eschatological reference, reaching out into our eternal destiny.¹ Finally the connexion of these great doctrines with Christian initiation is, if possible, even more

¹ The whole of this theme may be said to recur in Phil iii, where the claim that "we" (of the new Israel) are the true circumcision (verse 3) is seen to involve *Koinonia* with Christ in his death and resurrection (verses 10, 11, 21) Cp. the parallels in Rom. vi and in Col. ii, 9-15.

ly fixed in the Epistle to the Ephesians. Here once more, and for the third time, we encounter the *arrabon* of the Spirit in a passage which, in a way characteristic of this style, resumes the earlier teaching. The writer (in i, 11-14) calls his readers back in thought to the beginnings of their Christian life. To himself and others, once Jews, he refers to "us who have hoped before in the Christ." He then turns to the Gentile Christians, as co-heirs of the grace in Christ, "in whom ye also, having heard the word of the truth, the gospel of your salvation—in whom having believed ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of the Promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance, unto redemption of God's own possession unto the praise of his glory." The eschatological reference of the sealing with (or by) the Spirit is repeated once again in a later chapter (iv, 30). The cumulative effect of these Pauline passages is to link the whole of our salvation with a gift of the Spirit which is conveyed by a "sealing" and involves an "anointing."

Does this diminish the significance of baptism as distinct from confirmation? Only, I think, if we make separations which are alien from the original idioms of thought. The Jewish mind saw a whole as something implicit in all its parts, and that without destroying the reality of the parts and distinct loci of reference. Thus in primitive Christian eschatology the death and resurrection of our Lord together constitute the one mystery of the new Exodus, witness the earliest liturgical observance of the Pascha. Yet this one mystery is also a double mystery which has two parts, namely, death and resurrection. Perhaps we can see in the double of initiation something analogous to this wholeness of the new Exodus through which the Christian neophytes pass. The theme of wholeness which includes distinctions cannot be developed in detail here. I will conclude, however, with two suggestions drawn mainly from the language of the Johannine writings.

(a) In the fourth gospel, as in the Old Testament, the symbolism of water is prominent; and perhaps we can discern a parallel. John baptized with water only; but Jesus, in whom the Spirit descended, is he who baptizes "in the Spirit" (John i, 33). Here is an antithesis between water and Spirit, just as in the first "beginning" the Spirit intervened to bring order out of watery chaos. When, however, the Word incarnate has stood in the waters of earth, water and Spirit are conjoined in the baptismal font; so

that to be born "of water and Spirit" is to be born "of the Spirit" (John iii, 5-8). So also in the second creation story (Gen. ii, 6, 7) man is created with water and Spirit. The figure of Adam, moulded from the moist earth, receives the Breath of God. Now in the imagery of Scripture "breath" can be both moist *and* windy; thus it can be either water *or* Spirit.¹ Accordingly the verbal identification of wind and Spirit, which occurs in John iii, 8 might point to a further identification between water and Spirit, as elsewhere in Scripture. This duly occurs in the next chapter where at the well of Sychar, the Spirit is identified with living water (iv, 14; cp. vii, 38, 39). Thus it is also in the baptismal rites. The Spirit, conjoined with water, first renews the whole man. Then, entering like water to the thirsty soul the Spirit becomes a fountain of life within.²

(2) In Acts x, 38, St. Peter tells Cornelius how, "after John's baptism . . . God anointed Jesus . . . with Holy Spirit and power." This saying provides the necessary theological background to the "chrism" doctrine of I John. "You have a chrism from the Holy One" points to him whom the Father anointed. For this we may compare another petrine utterance: "Thou art the Holy One of God" (John vi, 69; cp. I John ii, 20). "Christians" are those who receive the anointing from the Anointed. The Father's action in anointing his Son is manifested afresh whenever Jesus through his appointed *shaliach* repeats the same act in his Church. Secondly, as the Spirit "abode upon him" (John i, 32), so now (says the Epistle) "the chrism which ye received from him abideth in you" (I John ii, 27). And (in the Gospel) the Paraclete "will teach you all things" (John xiv, 26), so (in the same passage of the Epistle) "his chrism teacheth you concerning all things." A somewhat similar identification of the Spirit with a "chrism" of anointing seems to be suggested, if not implied, in St. Peter's words to Cornelius, already cited. This use of language appears to exemplify a characteristically Hebrew idiom of thought: God is present in his words and acts, and again (by further extension) in the instruments of those words and acts. Zechariah's flying roll which embodied the divine word

¹ Cp. the πνεῦμα δρόσου or "moist whistling wind" of Dan. iii, 50.

² So in Rev. vii, 14-17 those who "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb" are afterwards led by him to slake their thirst at the fountains of waters.

action further illustrates this mode of expression.¹ The term, however, does not in itself differentiate between a presence in power and efficacy and a presence in substance. No single idiom of language can, of itself, comprehend all aspects of truth involved. Nevertheless, in the Johannine style, this divinely inspired way of speaking has the effect of including all the mysteries of the Catholic Creed in the act of Chrismation. For the mysteries of the Trinity and of Christology are alike implied in the act. Thus the sacramental act testifies to all the treasures of orthodoxy. "Hereby we receive the Spirit of God" (I John iv, 2), whenever those words are fulfilled: "he taketh of mine and declareth it to you" (John xvi, 15). In a word—the testimony of the Spirit to Christ in the Church is implicit in the characteristic workings of Jesus in his Church.

L. S. THORNTON, C.R.

The Holy Ghost and the Mystical Body of Christ

IN the Preface to his book, *The Spirit and the Bride*, Dom Guéranger writes: "A very short period of thought on the subject has convinced me of the futility of treating of the Holy Ghost without at the same time speaking of the Church; it would be tantamount to giving a theological position on the Second Person of the Trinity without mentioning the Incarnation."

Quite independently of this passage, much the same idea occurred to me when Dom Bede Winslow honoured me by asking me to read a paper before a Conference dealing with the Holy Spirit. As the relations of the Third Person of the Holy Trinity with the Church had not yet found a place among the addresses to be delivered, I suggested this subject which he accepted. I trust the significance of the title will appear more clearly later on.

There are two terms in this title. The first of them in its different aspects has been adequately developed by earlier writers. There is no need for me to repeat what they have said, but I reserve the right to come back on certain of these aspects when necessary.

¹ 1 Sam. v, 1-4. We can compare also the language used in I Sam. v, 11, concerning the ark of God.

As with other theological terms, "Mystical Body of Christ" can take on several rather different meanings; it is an analogous expression. In my study I shall take it in the sense in which it was used by His Holiness Pope Pius XII in his Encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi* of 29th June 1943 to which in general I owe a great deal. I mean then by this expression the Roman Catholic Church and I shall therefore use indifferently either of these appellations.

I

Pius XII tells us that Jesus Christ could have bestowed the fruits of his Redemption, or rather the fruit of his Redemption which is the Holy Ghost, directly on each single human being. However (I quote): "but he willed to do this by means of a visible Church in which men would be united, and through which they would co-operate with him in distributing the divine fruits of Redemption. As the Word of God vouchsafed to use our nature to redeem men by his pains and torments, in a somewhat similar way he makes use of his Church throughout the ages to perpetuate the work he had begun."¹

So then, the sending forth of the Holy Ghost upon mankind by the glorified Christ, was not immediately his co-called invisible mission into the souls of men, but the visible mission into an already existing, albeit imperfectly existing, society, which the same Saviour, while still in his humiliated state, had formed during his earthly life, and which was to serve as intermediary for the invisible mission.

The Catholic Church was thus formed by two missions: the mission of the Holy Ghost, which we may call "pneumatic"; the mission called by the Holy Father "juridical," which is the sending out into the world of the Apostles charged with the threefold ministry, priestly, royal and prophetic, of their master. "Hence there can be no real opposition or incompatibility between the invisible mission of the Holy Spirit and the juridical office which pastors and teachers have received from Christ. Like body and soul in us, the two realities are complementary and perfect each other, both having their origin in our one and the same Saviour who not only said, as He breathed the divine Spirit upon the Apostles: 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost' (John xx, 22), but also enjoined

¹ *The Mystical Body of Jesus Christ* (C.T.S.) p. 11, bottom.

oud : ' As the Father hath sent me, I also send you ' (John 1, 21), and again : ' He that heareth you heareth me ' (Luke 10, 16)."¹

Earlier on the pope had said : " If the juridical mission of the Church and her power to teach, to govern, and to administer the sacraments, have supernatural efficacy and virtue for the building up of the Body of Christ, it is only because Christ Jesus on the Cross opened up to his church the well-spring of those divine gifts."²

It is obviously impossible to deal with this double mission fully in an hour. I shall not speak of the Church's juridical mission—to a part of which has been devoted recently from the Anglican side that magnificent book, *The Apostolic Ministry*—because this mission derives more particularly from Christ the founder of the Church, than from the Paraclete. It is in view of this unavoidable incompleteness necessitated by the limited aim I have in view, that I have quoted the Holy Father at such length, to avoid even the slightest suspicion of leaning towards the error he condemns, which consists in separating from or even opposing to a juridical Church, a " Church of love."

I shall not speak of the invisible mission of the Holy Ghost to souls either, because it seems to me less directly social, and because, as we have just heard, it could have been given quite independently of the Church.

I shall confine myself to what strikes me as the very kernel of my subject : the *visible* mission of the Spirit in the *Society* of the Church, the mission which Pius XII calls, following the word for word Leo XIII³ " the soul of the Church," choosing thus with the weight of papal authority and for a second time the famous statement of the Doctor of the West, saint Augustine : " The Holy Spirit is in the Church, the Body of Christ, what the soul is in our bodies "⁴ It is my desire that this present paper should in its turn echo these same words.

II

Amongst Catholic theologians there exists a difference of opinion as to the exact meaning of the Mystery of Pentecost. Was it the actual inbreathing of the Spirit into the Body of

¹ Ibid, p. 40, top.

² Ibid., p. 21, top.

³ Encyclical *Divinum Illud Munus*, 9th May 1897.

⁴ Serm. de Temp. cclxviii. PL 38, 1232, *et passim*.

the Church, or was it merely the public manifestation of this inbreathing which had taken place in reality at the moment of the Lord's death on the Cross. Pius XII and Leo XIII take this latter view. We have no intention, for our part, of entering into the controversy. We are primarily interested in the effects of the inbreathing and these become known only when they are publicly manifested.

* * *

The faithful "remnant" or the "saints" of Israel¹ foretold by the prophets, or again the "little flock"² receive at last, in "these latter days" foreseen by Joel, the Holy Spirit. They are the Virgin Mary, the Twelve and a few of the Lord's disciples, a society already partially organized by the Lord. In accordance with his orders, they are gathered together praying to receive the Spirit he has promised, but which had not yet been given, "because Jesus had not yet been glorified."³ Who is this Spirit? He who, from the moment of his conception, had anointed Jesus to make of him the Christ, the Messiah according to the prophecies. "The spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him: the spirit of wisdom and of understanding, the spirit of counsel and of fortitude, the spirit of knowledge and of godliness,"⁴ or again, according to the same Isaiah read by our Lord in the synagogue at Nazareth: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me"; the same in whom Christ during his life on earth had performed all his actions, including the greatest of them all, his offering of himself on the Cross to his Father.⁵

By sending this Spirit upon the "remnant" of Israel, the glorified Lord bestows upon it his Messianic anointing, and in so doing unites it to himself in such a way that he becomes its Head from which the anointing oil flows down, and its sustainer, thus making of this "remnant," as it were, a kind of addition to his humanity. A union of this kind, which is not the hypostatic union itself but a sharing in it, would have been impossible if Christ had remained

¹ I Macch. x, 39, 44; Wisdom xviii, 1; Is. iv, 3, etc.

² Luke xii, 32.

³ John vii, 39.

⁴ Is. xi, 1-3.

⁵ Cf. Heb. ix, 14.

bodily present with his flock: "It is good for you that I go away, for, if I go not away, the Paraclete will not come to you; but if I go away, I shall send him to you";¹ and with the Paraclete, as we have been reminded, Christ also comes back in a spiritual manner.

Previously of course, the Holy Spirit had taken a special care of the "remnant" of Israel, but he did so only in an outward, transitory, conditional way, depending on the fidelity of this "remnant," and his chief mode of action was the ministry of the prophets, "who spake by the Prophets." Now he is given inwardly, absolutely and forever. Nothing can henceforth drive him out. In this way is realized the prophecy of the Temple of God, made for example by Ezechiel:² "Son of man, this is the place of My throne, the place where I shall set the sole of my foot: I shall dwell here for ever in the midst of the children of Israel."

We can go further. Not only does the Holy Spirit now dwell in the "remnant" of Israel; he dwells there only and nowhere else, the world cannot know him or receive him. The "remnant" becomes his rightful place, as the rightful place of the incarnate Word is henceforward at the right hand of the Father. The ancient doxologies prove this amply, for instance the following from Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition*: "Glory be to Thee, O Father, and to the Son, with the Holy Ghost in the Holy Church." At least this is Nautin's opinion in his recently published study.³ He confirms this opinion by the witness of Fathers before Hippolytus, for example, St. Irenaeus with his famous adage: "Where the Church is, there is the Holy Spirit," and in our day Pius XII teaches in his Encyclical that the "Holy Spirit refuses to dwell with his sanctifying grace in the members who are entirely separated from the body."⁴

Whosoever therefore desires to receive the Spirit must hasten "towards the Church where the Spirit is active,"⁵ and for a member of the Church there should be nothing he dreads more than to be separated from her. St. Augustine

¹ John xvi, 7.

² xlili, 7.

³ P. NAUTIN: *Je crois à l'Esprit-Saint dans la Sainte Eglise pour la correction de la chair*. Etude sur l'histoire et la théologie du Symbole. Coll. Unam Sanctam, xvii. Paris, Ed. du Cerf, 1947.

⁴ Ibid., p. 35, par. 55.

⁵ Hippolytus, lxxvii, 30. Edited by Hauler, p. 117.

is particularly eloquent on this point developing it at considerable length.¹

The dwelling of the Holy Spirit in the "remnant" will have as its result the communicating to it of a unity which it had not previously had, even after its organization by Christ, being then more in the nature of an aggregate, the "People of God." It now becomes an organic whole, having as its soul the Spirit. "There is one Body and one Spirit."² In this way it acquires a certain personification which it is difficult to grasp exactly and which Dom Vonier³ situates in between the entity of a crowd and that of a physical person. From now on one will be better able to use the name "Bride." Hermas sees the Church in woman's form and the first Christian commentators on the Song of Songs will see in the Beloved a figure of the Church.

That is not the last of the gains made by the "remnant" in receiving the Messianic anointing. The Spirit of Christ gives it a likeness to Christ which we may call a "Christ-likeness," makes of it a "helper like unto him."⁴ As the Holy Spirit, he confers on this "remnant" that Messianic holiness which the appellation "holy," so frequently applied to it under the Old Covenant, merely foreshadowed. It is curious to note that whereas in the Septuagint the adjective "holy" frequently qualifies words which announce the term ἐκκλησία, for example κλητὴ ἁγία⁵ or ἐπὶ κλητος ἁγία,⁶ in the New Testament on the other hand we find this adjective joined to ἐκκλησία only in the Epistle to the Ephesians.⁷ The expression ἁγία ἐκκλησία develops later on in Christian

¹ "A Christian must fear nothing so much as to be separated from the Body of Christ. Separated from the Body of Christ he is no longer his member, he is no longer strengthened and nourished by his Spirit" (*In Ioan. Tract.* xxvii. PL 35, 1612). "Do you wish to live by the Spirit of Christ? Be in the Body of Christ . . . My body lives by my spirit, yours by your spirit. The Body of Christ can only live by the Spirit of Christ" (*ibid.*). "See here what you must avoid. It may happen that a member, a hand, a finger, a foot, be cut off from a human body . . . Does the soul follow the severed member? In the body, it was alive; severed it has lost all its life. So it is with the Catholic Christian so long as he lives in the Body, but cut off, he becomes a heretic. The spirit does not follow the amputated limb" (*Serm.* cclxvii, 4. PL 38, 1231).

² Eph. iv, 4.

³ A. VONIER: *Das Mystrium der Kirche*, Drei Vorlesungen. Salzburg, Bücherei der Salzburger Hochschulwochen, 1934, p. 32.

⁴ Gen. ii, 20.

⁵ Exod. xii, 16; Lev. xxiii, 2, 3, 4, 7, etc.

⁶ Num. xxviii, 18, 26, etc.

⁷ Eph. v, 27.

tradition to become stereotyped after its introduction into the Apostles' Creed so called.

The changing of the "remnant" of Israel by the Mystery of Pentecost goes further still. Because it is now his "holy Bride," it now forms one flesh with the glorified Christ, it is mysteriously identified with him. Thus Saul, in the very act of persecuting it, hears the Lord saying to him, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?"¹

* * *

We have not yet exhausted the profound changes in the "remnant" of Israel brought about by the descent upon it of the Messianic Spirit—and even so I dare say there are some that are escaping me.

While we know that this Spirit is given to it and to it alone, not to the world, nevertheless those who are of the world can yet be touched by the Spirit, in which case they must join themselves to the "remnant."

On the day of Pentecost certain of those of the circumcision hear Peter's words, are impressed and ask him what they are to do. The reply is: Repent and be baptized and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit, "for for you is the promise and for your children and for all who are afar off, as many as the Lord shall call."² Note here two things. Firstly, the joining to the "remnant" of those chosen from the world is effected by baptism; secondly, this choice made by God seems on the whole a normal thing in the world of the circumcision. But a little later an unheard-of happening occurs. We read in the tenth chapter of Acts that after the preaching of St. Peter in the house of Cornelius, the Holy Spirit came down upon the uncircumcised members of the company also, to the stupefaction of all, and they also were able to receive baptism and be joined to the "remnant."

This unification by adjunction was a thing so new for the conscience of the Old Israel to which the "remnant" still belonged, psychologically at least, that quite a considerable time was necessary before normal relations were established in the "remnant" between Christians come from the circumcision and those come from the uncircumcision. Indeed does not St. Paul give us to understand in the epistle to the Romans that there will always remain a difference between

¹ Acts ix, 4, *et passim*.

² Acts ii, 37-9.

them based on a different election by God? But that is a point I cannot go into here.

That is the most noteworthy, the most manifest change which took place in the "remnant." It had been announced by the prophets as an event of the Messianic Age; St. Paul attaches to it the very greatest importance in the work of Christ. In the epistle to the Ephesians, for example, we read: "But now in Jesus Christ you who were once afar off have been brought together by the Blood of Christ. For he is our peace, he who of two (Jews and Gentiles) has made one, casting down the wall of separation etc."¹ From a national society, from the Israel according to the flesh or the circumcision, it becomes a society transcending national and other differences, since henceforward it contains "neither Jew, nor Greek, nor slave, nor freeman, nor man, nor woman, for ye are all one in Jesus Christ,"² one Israel according to the Spirit. All who receive baptism enter into, partake of the Messianic anointing. Certain of the ancient Fathers, Origen in the East and Prosper of Aquitaine in the West for example, apply to this astounding event the following verse of psalm cxxxii: "It is like the costly oil, which poured out on the head, flows down on to the beard, the beard of Aaron, yea, which flows down even to the hem of his garment," to show in this way the gradual spreading out over the whole of mankind of the Messianic anointing begun at least at Pentecost.

III

In these rough outlines, the Mystery of Pentecost, the chief fruit of the New Covenant in the Blood of Christ as we are taught to call it, makes of the "remnant" of Israel an extension of the Messianic humanity of Christ, its plenitude, in which the Spirit of Christ dwells for ever and exclusively, giving it a substantial unity in Christ, a likeness, and even a kind of identity with him, a unity in which all men without distinction can join by means of the election of God and baptism. Thus the prophecies are fulfilled, the Messianic Age for mankind begins and the Catholic Church is established as an instrument to co-operate with Christ in the application of the fruits of his Redemption, an application which Catholic theologians often call the subjective Redemption to dis-

¹ ii, 13 sq.

² Gal. iii, 28.

tinguish it from the reality which is applied and which they call the objective Redemption.

It is this subjective Redemption by and in the Church which we are going to examine for a few moments, confining ourselves, as I have said, to its social side only, without dealing with the redemption of individual souls.

* * *

Saint Paul offers us the reality we are endeavouring to understand under the form of the growth of the ecclesiastical entity "unto the state of a perfect man, unto the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ."¹ One could, once more in Pauline terms, call this process an ever greater transformation in Christ until "it is given to us, all alike, to catch the glory of the Lord as in a mirror, with faces unveiled; and so we become transfigured into the same likeness, borrowing glory from that glory."² The two words "unto" and "until" point to a goal of fulfilment, an eschatology, when Christ will hand over his glorified Bride to the Father and God will be all in all;³ the "remnant" of Israel will then become the "whole" of Israel. The Mystery of Pentecost, while opening the Messianic Age, is only a starting point for its final completion and the opening of the age which will last for ever, the Kingdom of God. Seen in this perspective the subjective Redemption can be called an eschatology under way and the "remnant" of Israel a seed, for it is to leaven hidden in three measures of flour, to a grain of mustard-seed that the Gospel parables compare the Kingdom of God.

In the growth of the ecclesiastical Body—as we needs must limit our subject—we shall examine neither its numerical extension, whether as a result of missionary labours or otherwise, nor its struggle with the Prince of this world. We shall direct our attention solely to the examination of its internal growth.

Here we must reckon—to mention the fact once only, while never losing sight of it—here we must reckon with the basic action of Christ himself, the Head, as we know, of this added humanity of his. This action is first of all a kind of nourishing, for "no man ever bore illwill to his own flesh and blood; no, he keeps it fed and warmed; and so

¹ Eph. iv, 13.

² II Cor. iii, 18.

³ I Cor. xv, 28.

it is with Christ and his Church";¹ a kind of vegetable growth. Think of the parable of the vine and the branches too well-known for me to go beyond a mere mention; finally let us quote the text from the epistle to the Ephesians: "On him all the body depends; it is organized and unified by each contact with the source which supplies it; and thus, each limb receiving the active power it needs, it achieves its natural growth, building itself up through charity."² This passage is commented on at length in Pius XII's Encyclical. Could not one say in view of this that Christ is himself the soul of his Body? Origen does say so in his *Contra Celsum*:³ "The Holy Scriptures state that the whole Church of God is the Body of Christ animated by the Son of God"; whereas in another work⁴ he attributes this same function to the Holy Spirit. We find the same reasoning in Pius XII who, in almost the same terms as those used for the life-giving work of Christ himself in his Body, describes that of the Holy Spirit whereby he merits, as we know, the designation, "Soul of the Church."

This interchanging of the roles of the Son and of the Holy Ghost in the work of the subjective Redemption is completely justified by the usage of Scripture and is absolutely constant. We know it and we shall not forget it when in our further development we speak only of the Holy Spirit's part in the building up of the ecclesiastical Body.

* * *

In this Body, unified to the point of real personification by the Spirit at its creation, and in which one might even wonder if the human persons composing it did not finally become simply impersonal parts of a physical whole, this same Messianic Spirit, sevenfold or even manifold, creates a diversity by distributing different gifts and in so doing exalts human personalities. I prefer to repeat once more, to avoid all possible misunderstanding, that faithful to our original plan, we shall not go into those of them which the scholastic theologians call the supernatural organism of the human soul, and which, in the view of certain recent German ecclesiologists like Koster and Deimel, constitute a man in

¹ Eph. v, 29.

² Eph. iv, 16.

³ *Contra Celsum* vi, 48. P.G. II, 1374.

⁴ *Comm. in Ep. ad Rom.* viii, 11. P.G. 14, 1193.

the Church a person in himself, an independent person, an *Eigenperson*. We are solely concerned in our examination with the *social* gifts of the Spirit, those which by giving him a social function, make of a man in the Church a member, a *Gliedperson*.¹

This is a completely Pauline line of thought : in the fourth chapter of the epistle to the Ephesians already quoted, after dwelling on the unity of the Body, the apostle enumerates the different ministries which help to build it up. We find exactly the same presentation in the twelfth chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians, the text is too well-known to need quotation. These functional differences involve certain responsibilities which the moral exhortations of the Pauline Epistles exalt and to which we shall return in a moment.

It is only this combination of unity and diversity which makes of the Church a real *body*, a whole organically knit together. In the words of Pius XII: "The Church for this³ special reason merits to be called a body, because it results from a suitable disposition and coherent union of parts, and is provided with members different from one another but harmoniously compacted."

The Old Israel had no such functional differentiation, and any moral responsibility, at least in early times, lay rather on the community than on the individual. Thus we find ourselves once more face to face with a formally Messianic trait of the ecclesiastical reality transformed by Pentecost and symbolized by the fact that the Holy Spirit descends as a separate tongue on each person present.

Following the lead given by Pius XII, let us put down one by one these different functions. The pope stands out against those who see in the Body of the Church only the hierarchy, or on the other hand only the charismatics, "those men endowed with miraculous powers the presence of which, moreover, will never be lacking to the Church";³ and he then enumerates the different states of life in the Church. The hierarchy, since it forms part of the juridical mission of the Mystical Body, does not concern us here.

As regards the other functions of the ecclesiastical Body, we may note that certain of them are the result of a permanent

L. DEIMEL: *Leib Christi. Sinn und Grenzen einer Deutung des innerkirchlichen Lebens*. Freiburg im Breisgau, 1940.

M. D. KOSTER: *Ekklesiologie im Werden*. Paderborn, 1940.

¹ Ibid., p. 13, par. 16.

³ Ibid., p. 13, par. 17.

gift of the Spirit, the religious life for example ; others spring from temporary gifts which we shall call charisms in a moment. We may think here of the extraordinary and extra-hierarchical missions which have appeared in the course of the Church's history, that of St. Catherine of Siena for instance, bringing the Papacy back from Avignon to Rome.

* * *

How does this organic differentiation in the Body of the Church help to its building up ?

The first epistle of St. Peter¹ gives us the answer, and this answer holds for all the gifts and all the functions in this Body : " Make one another free of what is yours ungrudgingly, sharing with all whatever gift each of you has received, as befits the stewards of a God so rich in graces," and Pius XII follows this when he writes : " And, in fact, as in our mortal organism when one member suffers the others suffer with it, and the healthy members come to the assistance of those that are ailing, so in the Church individual members do not live only for themselves ; they also help their fellow-members, all co-operating with one another for their mutual support and for the constant growth of the whole Body."² Why is that so ? Because, as we know, the different gifts come from the *One* Spirit who distributes them to whom He will.

The building up of the Body is effected then, as we see, by the sharing together of gifts, by *κοινωνία*, for that is the exact meaning of this word in the language of the New Testament. It can be called a unification of diversity by *moral* means. This *κοινωνία* can take on either one of two chief forms according to the character of the goods to be shared. These are either spiritual goods—and this is where the theological expression " the Communion of Saints " finds its place, in whatever sense it be understood—or material goods. These two forms are frequently interdependent and the communion in material things symbolizes the other. All of us, I suppose begin to think immediately of the collections made by the Christian communities founded by St. Paul in aid of the mother community in Jerusalem, from which they had received so many graces. How often does not the Apostle remind them of this work, not only of charity

¹ I Peter iv, 10.

² Ibid., p. 13, par. 15.

out of justice.¹ If we ponder the question well, we shall see that *κοινωνία* is the social form of that charity which has been poured forth in the hearts of individual Christians by the Holy Spirit, which according to our *social* plan we have omitted, and which is, as St. Paul tells us, without hypocrisy, seeking not its own interest, free of all envy, and humble. This is how L. Deimel in his remarkable book mentioned above describes the relations between charity and the social charisms of the Spirit: the charisms favour the development of charity, and charity favours the right and zealous use of charisms.

The right use of charisms in the Body of Christ serves to build it up, because it engenders peace in the Body, that peace to which "men have been called in one and the same Body,"² a peace which is Christ's because it is he, not the world, who gives it, that peace which is the fruit of the Redemption, which is Christ himself, "for he is our peace,"³ and which the prophets announced for the Messianic Kingdom.

The "remnant" of Israel scarcely yet transformed by the Mystery of Pentecost, furnishes us with a living example of this peace. "There was one heart and soul in all the company of believers; none of them called any of his possessions his own, everything was shared in common *κοινῇ*."⁴ Their onglemindedness was a result of the fact that they all shared the same thoughts, those of Christ, according to St. Paul's advice to the Philippians. This is how Origen expresses it: "Practising all together all the time one wisdom, their minds at one, their hearts at one, they worship the one God, they acknowledge the one Jesus Christ, they are filled with the one Spirit of God."⁵ We can sum up all this in the Christ-likeness of all. This, being a direct consequence of Messianic anointing of the New Israel, brings us back to a psalm which the whole of Christian tradition has used in this connexion and from which we have already quoted a verse or two. We have here in very truth the "Behold how good and joyful a thing it is to dwell together, brethren, in unity."⁶

We mentioned a moment ago the social responsibilities in the Body of Christ. Properly speaking there is but one,

¹ II Cor. viii, 14; x, 13.

² Col. iii, 15.

³ Eph. ii, 14.

⁴ Acts iv, 32.

⁵ *In Lib. Reg. Hom.* i, 4. P.G. 12, 999.

⁶ Ps. cxxxii, 1.

charity. "Do not let anybody have a claim upon you, except the claim which binds us to love one another. The man who loves his neighbour has done all that the law demands,"¹ the law of a member of the pneumatic Body, of a *Gliedperson*. Having fulfilled it he will himself become pneumatic.

Nevertheless, all those in the pneumatic Body are not moved by its soul. It contains sinners. I quote Pius XII again. "But the fact that the Body of the Church bears the august name of Christ must not lead anyone to suppose that, also during this time of its earthly pilgrimage, its membership is restricted to those who are eminent in sanctity, or that it is composed only of those whom God has predestined to eternal beatitude. For it is in keeping with the infinite mercy of our Saviour that he does not here refuse a place in his Mystical Body to those whom he formerly admitted to his table."²

Like the virtues, sin also belongs to the domain of individual souls, which I have excluded from my subject although both have social consequences. There is however a social sin opposed to social charity, *κοινωνία*, which for this reason I must mention, and which will remind us that we are still investigating the role of the Holy Spirit in the subjective Redemption. You have guessed, I daresay, that I mean the sin of selfishness, the seeking of one's own private advantage, leading to separation and schism. The very first days of the Pentecostal community which furnished us a little earlier with the example of *κοινωνία*, now give us an example of the opposite sin; you will remember the sin of Ananias and Sapphira. Egoists like these, are the carnally-minded men in the Body of Christ, the stirrers-up of schism, who do not do their duty as members. The Western Fathers, an Augustine,³ a Fulgentius of Ruspa,⁴ a Pope Pelagius I⁵ apply to them, St. Jude, 18-19: "(The Apostles) told you that mocking spirits must needs appear in the last age, who would make their own ungodly appetites into a rule of life. Such are the men who now keep themselves apart; animal natures, without the life of the Spirit." Hermas, to give a final summing up, shows us⁶ the Church

¹ Rom. xiii, 8.

² Ibid., p. 16, par. 22.

³ *Serm.* viii, 13. PL 38, 73.

⁴ *Ad Monimum* ii, 11. PL 65, 191.

⁵ *Epist. Viatori et Pancratio*. PL 69, 412.

⁶ *Vis.* iii, 6, 8.

like a tower built of squared stones so well joined together that they seem to form one single block. Round stones can find no place there, as roundness is the sign of self-sufficiency, for indeed, if certain divisions, certain roughnesses are tolerated by the Spirit in the Body of Christ, once a certain limit is passed, they are cast out and the unity of the Body remains unharmed. "Who could ever suggest," says St. Cyprian, "that this unity, sprung from the divine stability and of like kind to the heavenly mysteries, could be rent in the Church and broken by the opposition of wills in disagreement?"¹

* * *

I think we should here make a short digression—even at the risk of appearing sketchy—and dwell on the social intellectual gifts of the Spirit, grouped around the gift of faith. For this reason, it is in the work of the building up of the Body of Christ that St. Paul places "the unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God"² and Fathers Clérissac³ and Vonier consider that it is faith which endows the Church with her "supernatural personality." Besides it is precisely these gifts in the Corinthian community which furnished St. Paul with an opportunity of setting out his teaching on the social Body of Christ and on the charisms in it.

The Messianic anointing of the "remnant" of Israel comprises in the first place the gift of truth, for it is above all the Spirit of truth⁴ which the Lord promises to his apostles. But the Spirit is truth," St. Irenaeus tells us in the continuation of his famous adage already quoted,⁵ and Chromatius of Aquileia⁶ goes further: "By his manifold grace he ever illumines the whole Body of the Church." Thus, by a further transformation, the "remnant" becomes "the pillar and the foundation of truth,"⁷ the sole and exclusive possessor of the charism of truth. His light then shines in and upon Jerusalem, as Isaiah sang; to join oneself to the "remnant" is to be enlightened. Hence the name enlightenment or

¹ *De Unitate* vi. PL 4, 519-20.

² Eph. iv, 13.

³ H. CLÉRISAC, O.P.: *Le Mystère de l'Eglise*. Paris, 1921.

⁴ John xiv, 17; xv, 26; xvi, 13.

⁵ *Adv. Haer.* iii, 24, 1 (38, 1). PG 7, 966.

⁶ *Tract. in Ev. Matth.* v, 4. PL 20, 342.

⁷ 1 Tim. iii, 5.

simply *πίστις* given by the ancient Fathers to baptism,¹ and in any case, before being baptized one must believe, as faith is the first grace.

In the Old Israel the Holy Spirit exercised a prophetic role as I have already pointed out: "Who spake by the Prophets." For this reason St. Justin and St. Irenaeus call him "the prophetic Spirit."² In the Messianic Israel the prophetic action of the Spirit will not be diminished but will take on higher forms. It will no longer be essentially a foretelling of the future, although this is still found in the Acts and in the Apocalypse, but, the continuation of the thought of Christ, as Père Clérissac says in his book quoted above, in agreement with the expression of the Apocalypse: "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy."³

Let us go a little deeper into this matter of prophecy in the Mystical Body. Let us recall merely to be able to leave it on one side the public Revelation and its writing down under the influence of a special inspiration of the Holy Spirit, in a word the forming of the deposit of the faith. This process which carries on that of the Old Testament, comes to an end with the end of the Apostolic Age. While the gift of infallibility to which we now come and which is of greater interest for us, belongs to his Body until the day of our Lord's return; this gift of understanding and teaching without error the truths contained in the deposit. It is this gift which makes the Lord's Bride absolutely spotless and holy.

In this gift of infallibility we must distinguish between its permanent and temporary forms.

If its permanent form is guaranteed in a special way to the apostolic hierarchy under the presidency of the successor of St. Peter thanks to the Lord's juridical mission—for this reason we pass on—it also belongs, under the control of this same hierarchy, to the community of the faithful, disposing it, among other effects, to accept the teaching of its pastors. In this manifestation, this gift is called the *sensus fidelium* or *sensus catholicus*.

¹ Thus St. Justin, *Apol.* I, 61, speaking of baptism, writes as follows: "This washing is called 'illumination' (*φωτισμός*) because those who learn these things are illumined in their minds." PG 6, 421.

² *Dialogue cum Tryph.* xxxii, 3; xxxviii, 2; xliii, 3, 4, etc. *Apol.* I, xxxiii, 2, 5; xxxv, 3; xxxviii, 1; St. Irenaei *Adv. Haer.* iv, xxxvi, 2.

³ *Apoc.* xix, 10.

The temporary form of the gift of infallibility is found in the teaching charisms distributed by the Spirit, as he wills, in the Body of Christ.

Whatever be the form of its manifestation, the proper object of the gift of infallibility is the understanding and explaining of the Scriptures inspired by the same Spirit. Did not the Lord himself on the evening of his resurrection give the example to the disciples of Emmaus? In the light of this principle we may say that Pius XII's Encyclical *Divino Afflante Spiritu* on biblical studies, published in the same year 1943 as *Mystici Corporis Christi*, along with the innumerable forms of the biblical revival amongst Catholics in our day, are particularly striking manifestations of the gift of prophecy in the Church of today.

Let us now turn to the problem of charisms or transitory gifts. The problem arose in the primitive Church, because they were then especially numerous, particularly during the liturgical gatherings; on the day of Pentecost itself the gift of tongues was shown forth. The terms of the problem were the following: the relative dignity of the different charisms, the order to be observed in their use to avoid disorder, and false charisms.

Apostolic authority respected the gifts of the Spirit: "Extinguish not the Spirit; despise not prophecies," St. Paul wrote to the Thessalonians,¹ but at the same time acted as their judge. A hierarchy depending on their value for the edification of the community, was established among the intellectual charisms, with prophecy, i.e., explanation of the Scriptures, at the head of the list, as being the most edifying; but, in case of dispute, St. Paul proclaimed the absolute primacy of the charism of all charisms, Charity. As for the false charisms, not unknown at Corinth,² in Asia³ and elsewhere,⁴ they are all in opposition to the "testimony of Jesus" and alien to his thought, and all tend to provoke dissension and disagreement.

Repeatedly in the history of the Church through the ages the charism problem has arisen anew and been solved. False prophecies have always questioned the permanence and the completeness of the deposit of the faith, of the "testimony of Jesus," e.g., Montanism in the second century and Joachim-

¹ I Thess. v, 19-20.

² II Cor. ii, 17.

³ I John iv, 1.

⁴ II Peter ii, 1.

ism in the twelfth, with their expectation of a new revelation of the Holy Spirit and a new, everlasting Covenant. The true charisms, on the other hand, have uniformly echoed the "testimony of Jesus" and have for that reason been more or less officially recognized by the hierarchy without ever being introduced into the sacred deposit of the spotless faith. The devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus can be set in the front rank of true prophetic charisms of modern times, as the lesson for the second nocturn of the Feast says: "Amongst the extraordinary advances in sacred doctrine and devotion by which the counsels of divine Wisdom are made daily more manifest to the Church, there is probably none more outstanding than the triumphal progress of the cult of the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus."

IV

The inner building up of the Body of Christ which is its part in the subjective Redemption can be identified, on the moral level we have chosen, with that Christian concord and peace which constitute the health of the Body and which gather together and recapitulate in unity, the diversity of gifts and ministries which are given by the one Spirit. The result of this is the manifestation, as it were, of the charismatic fullness of this Messianic Spirit, and a reflexion of the fullness of God for his glorification.¹ I believe this is where we touch the catholicity, which one might call qualitative, of the Mystical Body, its extensive Catholicity or universality falling outside our province.

Let us consider this for a few minutes.

* * *

Pius XII tells us that the social Body of Christ—and this is why it must be called mystical—has something more than a merely moral unity consisting in the common pursuit of a common aim under the direction of a common authority, because it possesses an inner principle "which surpasses immeasurably all the bonds of unity which form the cohesion of a social body."² This principle is the Holy Spirit who is therefore the root of Catholicity.

¹ Eph. iii, 10.

² Ibid., p. 38, top of page.

Is concord its supreme fruit, or does Revelation show us still more perfect forms of unity in diversity, i.e. Catholicity, capable of meriting more adequately the quality of mystical for the Body of Christ? The German theologians Deimel and Koster, whose remarkable ecclesiological works published during the war we have already mentioned, do not seem to think so and see in this concord, this *functional* union, if you prefer, the essence of the Church.

And yet, there is a passage of Scripture which says more. It is once again in St. Paul¹ where he deals with the charitable use of gifts, of the *κοινωνία* which engenders concord: "We, being many, are one bread, one body: all that partake of one bread."

There is here something more than the image of an almost physical union, of a conglomeration of grains in the sense of the famous eucharological text of the Didache and used again by Pius XII. Yes, it is a symbol, we must grant that, but an efficacious symbol, a sacrament. Although Pius XII assigns the sacraments, "those wonderful means of growth given by Christ to his Body," their place in the juridical mission of the Church which I have excluded from my subject, I shall pause to consider the sacrament of the Eucharist and you will see why.

* * *

In this sacrament the Holy Spirit produces not only a "Christ-likeness" as everywhere else in the Church, but "Christ-sameness," the real presence, body, soul and divinity, of Christ. This presence is not in contradiction with the Lord's statement noted earlier in this paper, according to which his absence is good for His disciples. On the contrary, he invented it, says St. Cyril,² on account of the marvellous union it produces. Christ is sacramentally present in the Eucharist in order to give himself as food. We examined a few moments ago certain examples of Christian *κοινωνία*; they seem very pale alongside the *κοινωνία* the Lord offers us now. He is not content to share with his brethren some spiritual gift; he gives them his Body, his blood, his divinity, his Spirit.

The Eucharistic food produces a sacramental effect, the *sacramenti*, in technical theological language. In this

¹ I Cor. x, 17.

² St. Cyr. Alex *In Ioan Ev.* xvii, 20-1, Lib. xi, 11. P.G. 74, 560.

effect the modern individualistic mentality considers primarily the union of the individual soul with Christ. This union is, of course, real, but does not come within the scope of our subject. The authentic Christian tradition sees in the *res* of the Eucharist first of all the social side. "The unity of the Mystical body is produced by the true Body of Christ sacramentally received," says St. Thomas. Ten centuries before him the anaphora of St. Hippolytus prayed thus: "And we beseech Thee, send Thy Holy Spirit down on the offering of the Holy Church, gathering together in unity all the saints who partake thereof, filling them with the Holy Ghost for the confirmation of the faith in truth."¹

There can be no doubt that it is social charity, κοινωνία, that the Eucharist engenders in the social Body of Christ, and it is for this reason that the ancient Fathers called it ἁγάπη, e.g. St. Ignatius.² It would seem from this that with the sacrament of the Eucharist the union of the Body of Christ, which we are studying, would not advance beyond the point where we had left it.

Here St. Cyril of Alexandria can bring us a new ray of light. In the passage referred to above he writes: "That we may be able to tend towards unity with God and with one another, that we may be able to blend together, although our bodies and our minds create differences between us, behold the plan which the only-begotten Son imagined by the Wisdom which came down in him and by the counsel of the Father. In one single Body, his own, he blesses his believers by his mystic transformation (μεταλήψει), and thus, he makes them of one and the same body (σύσσωμοι) both with himself and with one another."

The "concorporeality" brought about by the sacrament of the Eucharist is more even than a supernatural concord. The union in the Mystical Body acquires thereby a physical, especially Christ-like character.

Finally, and this is another reason why I can and must speak this afternoon of the Eucharist, during the Middle Ages a shifting of terms took place from the sacramental Body of Christ to the Church, the social Body of Christ which is, as we know, its proper sacramental effect, in technical terms then from the *res et sacramentum* to the *res tantum*. This shifting has been the object of a remarkable study by Père de Lubac, S.J., in his book, *Corpus mysticum*. *L'Euchar-*

¹ Hippolytus, lxx, 27. Edited by Hauler, p. 107.

² *Ad Smyrn.* viii, 1-2.

istie et l'Eglise au Moyen âge. Here is his conclusion summarized. Originally in Latin Christian literature, *Corpus mysticum* meant the Body of Christ present in the Eucharist, while the social Body of Christ was simply called the Body of Christ which is the Church. With the beginning of the controversy on the real presence, to avoid all misunderstanding, the adjective "mystical" which might appear to mean not real, was transferred from the sacramental Body to the social Body. Pius XII has consecrated this terminology in his Encyclical, finding "mystical" appropriate to express the very special unity of the social Body of Christ. These brief historical considerations will be useful in enabling us to understand the absence in the Christian East of the expression, "the Mystical Body of Christ." Last but not least has not the very title of this paper undergone a somewhat similar transmutation? Originally it was *The Holy Spirit and the Eucharist*, but in good theological logic it has finally become what it is now!

* * *

Holy Scripture will not yet allow us to stop in our theological examination of the union of the members of Christ's Mystical Body as the end of its redemptive work, at the "concorporeal" union.

After instituting the sacrament of the Eucharist and before completing the so-called objective Redemption, Christ *prayed* for the unity of those who should believe in him comparing it to the unity he has with his Father: "That all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us."

On this Trinitarian scale the mutual union of the members of the social Body of Christ brought about by the Spirit, is seen not only as a physical unity, but even to a certain extent as a consubstantial unity, and, one might say, "Trinity-like." "Unity in plurality, an image of the Trinity, why, it is the Church," says Bossuet.¹ Is not this union the final fruit of the Redemption, at the threshold of, if not actually in, the Kingdom of God, and is it not first and foremost this unity which deserves for the Social Body of Christ the epithet "Mystical"? The consummation of this union is particularly

¹ Quoted in M. J. SCHEEBEN.—AUG. KERKVOORDE: *Le Mystère de l'Eglise et de ses sacrements*. Coll. Unam Sanctam, xv. Paris, Ed. du Cerf, 1945, p. 55.

appropriate to the Holy Spirit, at least in the Western tradition, since this latter has seen in the Spirit, as it were, the hypostatical love of the Father for the Son and vice-versa, the substantial bond between them.

* * *

I must ask your patience for two more short considerations before I come to the conclusions to be drawn.

In the same eschatological line and in close connexion with the Eucharist must be placed the resurrection of the dead. This would even seem to be the work *par excellence* of the Holy Spirit if we are to believe Père Nautin who, supported in this by the historical antecedents of the Apostles' Creed, joins the Holy Spirit *in* the Holy Church with the resurrection of the body. We find here again the essential parallelism between the action of the Holy Spirit in the Messianic humanity of the incarnate Word and his action in the Word's superadded Messianic Humanity, the Church. "And if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you," runs the epistle to the Romans,¹ "He that raised up Jesus Christ from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies, because of his Spirit that dwelleth in you." He already does so in a certain fashion by nourishing the bodies of his members with the food of immortality.

There is moreover one member of the Mystical Body in addition to the Head who has already risen in the body. It is for this reason and for many more besides which can all be brought down to a perfect quickening by the Holy Spirit—a great moment in this being Pentecost—that this member, the Most Holy Virgin and Mother of God, Mary, can and must be taken as the symbol of the Mystical Body of Christ, Isaiah's Messianic "remnant," in its relations with the Holy Spirit.

V

What we have been considering together this afternoon is fundamentally, to a certain extent no doubt as a result of the limits set to our subject, the theology of the operation of the Holy Spirit *ad extra*, towards what is external to the Trinity, his "economic" theology, as early writers called it by opposition to his *theology* properly so-called which concerns

¹ Rom. viii, 11.

his relations within the Trinity, and which earlier speakers have considered. The early Fathers and Councils up to the Arian crisis had no other method in treating this mystery than that adopted by God himself in the Bible, if one may so express oneself.

That is why my exposition has followed, even if a little freely, the teachings of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds. We have met with at least the bare mention of the following terms : I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints, the resurrection of the body ; further : " and in the Holy Ghost the . . . Giver of life . . . who spake by the prophets. And one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church . . . I look for the resurrection of the dead." On the other we have omitted everything touching the remission of sins and also the whole of the theology properly so-called of the Holy Ghost which was clarified after the Council of Nicea and of which you have already heard competent expositions.

It is precisely this " economic " theology which Cardinal Manning desired at the Vatican Council¹ to see studied by the theologians and proposed to the faithful by the authority of the Church. Dom Vonier also had it in view in the passage by which I began my study and of which we can now better understand the aptness.

Our first conclusion is that the Holy Spirit's work *ad extra* is the Holy Church, Messianic mankind, from its visible founding on the day of Pentecost until the Lord's second coming. This period constitutes the pentecostal time or age, intermediate between the Synagogue and the Kingdom of God ; and the Lord's latter coming alone, contrary to all the eschatological mouthings of false prophecies, will begin the really new, final age of the Kingdom.

This work of the Holy Spirit represented by the Church, can be called a renewal both for the circumcised and for the uncircumcised, and a unification of diversities in a fullness of variety. The image of the Mystical Body is what best figures this work, whether it be the universal Church, our subject, or the local Church inasmuch as this remains in communion with her. The Holy Spirit can and must be called the soul of this Body, the soul purely and simply for certain theologians, for others the uncreated soul which animates the Body only through the intermediary of the soul constituted by his gifts and called the created soul. I note

¹ VONIER, op. cit., p. 33.

this controversy, a rather burning question some ten years ago, less so now, and left open by the Encyclical.¹ I wonder—and this is rather in the nature of a question—if the reality of this animation of the Church by the Holy Spirit *as its soul*, with all that we have seen this to imply, is not the clearest dividing line between the Catholic and Protestant attitudes in ecclesiology. But let us continue.

The task of the unifying of the Mystical Body by its soul is a *redemptive* process. At first sight this statement may seem strange as sin has scarcely entered into our exposition; and yet St. John says in his Gospel that Jesus had to die for the nation; and also “to gather together in one the children of God that were dispersed,”² and we may add with the collect for the feast of Christ the King, “dispersed by the wounds of sin, *peccati vulnere disgregati*.”

Furthermore St. John Chrysostom writes, “For the Spirit is given to unite those who had been divided by race and manners.”³ We can conclude that whatever in the Mystical Body is a factor of unity is insofar a factor of redemption, and all that is already at unity is already redeemed. On the other hand, nothing in it except the Head and the Virgin Mary is in strict rigour of terms glorified.

Finally in the same way as we remarked, earlier, on the impossibility of separating the “economy” (dispensation) of the Holy Ghost from the Church, so we can now say that the Church herself cannot be separated from the subjective Redemption, she is the locus of this Redemption to the exclusion of all other: *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*.

Every operation *ad extra* of a Person of the Holy Trinity is the common operation of the three Persons. This principle of Trinitarian theology is again emphasized by Pius XII in his Encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi*. I have no intention of reconciling here this statement with what has just been said, by invoking the principle of appropriation either in its Latin or its Greek interpretation, for in the present case there is no need of a reconciliation. The community of action in the Church between the Holy Spirit and the glorified Christ which has been mentioned above, is so clear that Protestant theologians have wholly identified this action and that in ante-Nicene theology Subordinationist conclusions

¹ M. J. CONGAR, O.P.: *Divided Christendom*. A Catholic Study of the Problem of Reunion. London, G. Bles, 1939, pp. 56, et seqq.

² John xi, 51-2.

³ *In Ep. ad Ephesios*, iv, ix, 3. P.G. 62, 72.

were sometimes drawn from it. As for the Catholic theologian, I wonder if he might not risk calling the "economic" Holy Spirit, the vicar of the glorified Christ, the "Kyrios." Dom Vonier says somewhere that the point of view I am trying to express by this term is proper to Catholicism. Non-Catholics have a tendency to make of the Mission of the Holy Ghost something independent of the Incarnation of the Word.

I feel convinced that a theology of the economy of the Holy Ghost must result in an accentuation of two of his attributes, viz. as Spirit of Christ and Spirit of truth. This theology will also check "economically" the Western *theology* of the Holy Ghost, as we have already hinted.

* * *

And now, very briefly, certain elementary conclusions as regards the question of Christian Unity.

We have seen that the Mystical Body of Christ has known in the past and knows still at the present day certain divisions, but here we must make a great distinction of fundamental importance.

Certain divisions are compatible with the unity of the Body and therefore remain in it. These are "schisms" in the most harmless meaning of the word, those of which St. Paul says, "Parties there must needs be among you."¹ The others are not compatible, find their place *outside* the Body and are schisms in the real meaning of the word.

The sole judge of this compatibility or incompatibility is the apostolic hierarchy.

Schisms properly so-called are sins against the Mystical Body. Those societies which are schismatic in this way, being outside the body, are no longer animated by the Holy Ghost as by their *soul*, but the Holy Spirit may be active in them "according to his good pleasure," much as he was active in the Old Israel.

Nevertheless, as regards the Mystical Body the members of these societies are on a different footing from that of the unbaptized; their situation has something analogous with that of the circumcised with regard to the New Israel. The task of the reunion of its members with the Mystical Body appears in this light as a work of Redemption, and, if it does not completely exhaust the content of the prayer, "That they may be one," it is at any rate one of its principal objectives.

¹ I Cor. xi, 19.

The manner of carrying out this task which results from the level on which we have taken our stand, must be the integration of the charisms distributed to these societies by the Holy Spirit, into the Catholic fullness of the Mystical Body by the practice of Christian *κοινωνία*, which may be called at this level the "eirenic method."

In this way for the glory of the Holy Trinity will be made ever more and more clear the truth expressed in the striking phrase of St. Irenaeus with which I close: "*In ea (Ecclesia) disposita est communicatio Christi, id est Sanctus Spiritus*, In the Church has been contrived (by God) the communication of Christ, that is, the Holy Spirit."¹

DOM CLEMENT LIALINE.

Appendix

IN 1942 the Convocations of Canterbury and York resolved to appoint joint Committees of each Convention to confer together and report on pastoral and practical questions concerning Confirmation. It may be argued that this is purely a domestic affair of the Church of England and so of no interest to us. As a matter of fact we venture to think that the subject under discussion, the articles written about it and the pamphlets printed or brought back into present prominence display such real scholarship and raise such nice points that they have a theological value which calls for our notice. This is specially so in the case of Dom Gregory Dix's two papers.

It seems therefore that the best way in which we can show our recognition of this discussion is by publishing an article in the Supplementary Issue Concerning the Holy Spirit.

We are indeed fortunate in having Père L. Bouyer to write this article for us and we are very grateful to him. He was not at the Conference and hence did not hear the paper read there by Fr. Thornton but he knows his views as contained in the pamphlet published in 1946.

THE EDITOR.

¹ *Adv. Haer.* iii, xxiv, 1. P.G. 7, 966.

Errata in Father Bouyer's Article on The Meaning and Importance of Confirmation

P. 95, 2nd par., 1.3: unusually.....read: unusually.

1.4: a deep.....read: deep.

1.6: after: that, supply: an.

P. 96, 2nd par., 1st line: We find.....read: Then, we find.

4th par., 9th line from the end: faithful, solemnly.....
read: faithful, is solemnly.

P. 97, 3rd par., 5th line from the end: **Balbio**.....read: **Bobio**.

P. 97, last par., 1.2: help.....read: helped.

1.8: **Hom**.....read **Hom.**,

P. 98, last par., 1.5 from the end, after: Bonaventura, add:).

P. 99, 11th line from the end, instead of: the rite to what it
consisted of, read: the primitive rite to what
it now consisted of.

P. 99, 4th line from the end, instead of the last word: of, read:
from.

P. 100, at the end of the 4th par., read: his sharply drawn
distinctions as to what was or was not the
sign, etc.

P. 101, 1st line: **catechumenarum**.....read **catechumenorum**.

9th line of the 2nd par.: in the case in.....read: is the
case in.

On the Meaning and Importance of Confirmation

RECENT discussions about Confirmation in the Church of England have produced some scholarly work that cannot be neglected by any Christian theologian. More especially, notice should be taken of two publications from the pen of Dom Gregory Dix. The first was *Confirmation or the Laying on of Hands* (*Theology, Occasional Papers*, No. 5) 1936, and more recently, his public lecture in the University of Oxford delivered on 22nd January 1946, at the invitation of the Lady Margaret Professor of Theology, Dr. F. L. Cross, *The Theology of Confirmation in Relation to Baptism* (Dacre Press). I must also mention Father L. S. Thornton's address to the Synod of the diocese of St. Alban's, in June 1945, but published (also by Dacre Press) only in January 1946, *Confirmation Today*.

In considering more directly Father Dix's contribution to the discussion, nobody will be surprised to find that he brings to his subject a fascinating combination of unusually great learning, a deep and quite unconventional insight into liturgy, and also pungent and brilliant criticism of all the unfortunate people who have ventured on the ground that unsparing providence was preparing for him to tread after them.

Among the vast amount of material provided by the productions of which we are now speaking, four points seem to us of paramount importance. We shall begin by stating these as briefly as we can, putting first what, in our own opinion, stands on a solid foundation—and last what we think cannot be convincingly proved in the present state of research and controversy. Later, we shall attempt to summarize the arguments in each case.

The first point Father Dix upholds and, as we see the matter, puts into a light that can no longer be ignored, is the very high importance of "Confirmation," as we now call it, in the primitive Church. It is nothing less than the sacramental gift, or, more precisely, the "seal" of the Spirit.

Next comes the somewhat revolutionary idea that the only thing that the Churches of the Reformation have been able to keep of the traditional Catholic doctrine on the subject—viz. the notion that it is a kind of ecclesiastical blessing to provide an *augmentum ad gratiam* of baptism, through which

the young Christian coming of age *post baptismum confirmatur ad pugnam*—far from being primitive, is merely a spurious accretion coming right from the False Decretals.

We find the somewhat startling assumption that “confirmation,” or, more precisely, the “seal” of the Spirit, given as an unction of holy oil “in the name of Jesus,” can be traced back to the Apostles, and that clear marks of its presence can be found in the New Testament, namely baptism of the Spirit, as opposed to baptism of water, although here it would not follow, *but rather would introduce* baptism of water, itself given in the name of the Trinity.

Last, but certainly not least, comes, the bold statement that the “laying on of hands” of the Apostles which we find in the Acts, followed by the coming down of the Spirit, has nothing to do with Confirmation, being in fact an ordination of prophets!

Concerning the first point, Father Dix, starting from a close commentary of the *Traditio Apostolica* of Hippolytus, shows very convincingly that “Baptism,” in the mind of the ancient Church, is generally understood as a comprehensive term for a celebration essentially public and corporate whose principal minister (as of the initiation mysteries taken as a whole) is the bishop, though assisted by the ministrations of priests, deacons etc. exactly as in the celebration of the Eucharist. In the course of this ceremony two points call for attention: the threefold immersion in water, connected with our Lord’s death and resurrection, and the “sealing” with Chrism by the bishop, connected with the pouring out of the Spirit. And that the sealing itself is the definitive introduction of the neophyte into the community of the faithful, solemnly proclaimed and brought into an effective reality by his first offering at, and communion in, the Paschal Mass which follows. Thus, the collective and corporate character of baptism (including what we now call Confirmation) is emphasized, from which proceeds the very important fact that the gift of the Spirit as such is nowhere understood as a kind of individual inspiration, but just the reverse, as the essential link with the whole Christian community.

From these premises Father Dix embarks upon an impressive demonstration of the other fact that, when patristic writers speak of “baptism in water and in the Spirit,” they nowhere understand an opposition between the external aspect of the sacrament and its inner meaning or content, but rather a

Meaning and Importance of Confirmation 97

short summary of the proceedings and their two *foci*. A text of Tertullian offers here a striking testimony (*Liber de Baptismo*, vi): "Not that in the waters we obtain the Holy Spirit, but that cleansed in the water we are prepared for the Spirit . . . The oil flows upon our flesh, but profits our spirit . . . then a hand is laid upon us, by its blessing calling down and inviting the Holy Ghost."

Mark here, with Dom Gregory Dix, that if the bishop lays his hands on the neophyte's head, so does the deacon at the baptism "in water,"¹ so that it is not the "laying on of hands" as such which is the proper sign of the Spirit coming down, but the unction.

Now we pass to our second point. It seems that a great change was brought into the practice of the Church when baptism began to be administered without the corporate assistance of the Church, and without the bishop taking the leading part. At this time, Dom Gregory Dix thinks, the Church in the East put all emphasis on chrismation by the priest (which is already to be found in Hippolytus) before the neophyte is brought to the bishop to be "sealed" by him, as we have seen above. Thus, chrismation took to itself the whole significance of the function formerly reserved to the bishop, and the latter's intervention disappeared altogether from the rite. The rite, however, retained its twofold structure of baptism in water (connected with the death and resurrection of Jesus) and in the Spirit (by means of oil). In the West, the same might have happened, and did in fact for a time operate in Gaul as we can see it in the Gallican liturgies (the *Missale Francorum*, the *Missale Gallicanum Vetus* and the *Balbion Missal*). But the Carolingian bishops, in their attempt to reintroduce it as an episcopal function to complete the Christian initiation, completely failed to recapture for it (even if they were still able to feel the want of any such thing) its primitive significance.

In fact, the word *confirmatio* used now instead of "seal" help this complete change of emphasis. It conveyed the idea of a mere perfecting of a reality already given in its entirety, instead of giving something itself. Such a radically impoverished idea was to be fostered by the popularity given to sentences from a sermon by an unknown French bishop in the late fifth century who is known to us under the usurped name of Eusebius of Emesa (*Hom de Pentecosta*, 4). In this discourse, the prelate attempts to give an answer to people

¹ In the rite of Hippolytus.

who ask : " What good can it do after the mystery of baptism to have someone to confirm us ? " The good bishop, in his efforts, probably doomed to failure, to enforce the injunction of Innocent I and St. Gregory the Great about the giving of the " seal " (just beginning then to be translated by *confirmatio*) to the bishops, hazarded the following conciliatory statement : " The Holy Ghost bestows at the font absolutely all that is needed to restore innocence. In confirmation, he gives an increase of grace (*augmentum praestat ad gratiam*) . . . In baptism, we are born to life ; after baptism, we are confirmed for Combat." These two sentences were to be quoted by the unknown forger of the False Decretals, in ninth century Gaul, as coming from Pope Melchiades (or Miltiades). He put them together with a fragment from St. Jerome's *Dialogue of a Luciferian with an Orthodox*, itself rewritten to be attributed to Pope Urban I, and which was nothing else than a disparagement of any intervention of the bishop in this matter—Jerome wanting to justify the already extant practice of completely omitting the " seal " under the notion that baptism in water by a presbyter was in itself sufficient to give the Spirit. Attributed to such prominent authorities, both texts were to be constantly quoted in the series of references on the subject given by Gratian. Then Peter Lombard quoted them after him, altogether omitting the saving clause which Gratian had himself kept—namely, " So closely are these two sacraments conjoined, that they may only be separated by death, and one cannot be performed without the other." Finally, working in the Lombard's own path, the Schoolmen would find it embarrassing to maintain that any particular " character " is given through confirmation, or anything else, save a vague strengthening of the gifts already complete in baptism as its proper content. So that the Protestant Reformers, rejecting the whole ceremony as non-apostolic and un-evangelical (an opinion which had already been more than implicitly admitted by Alexander of Hales and St. Bonaventura and in accepting it only as an ecclesiastical blessing, eradicated all that was not based on the Pseudo-Isidorian forgery, while getting rid of what still lingered in the Church of its truly primitive origin—the seal of the Spirit.

We have not given in this summary the whole thesis, set forth with much care and precision by Father Dix, but we do not think we have been unfair to him, but rather that such a reduction to its main lines shows best its coherence

Meaning and Importance of Confirmation 99

and inner cogency. It will be seen that this argument is closely connected with the contemporary mode of Anglican polemics against the Protestant position, that is the demonstration of the Protestant indebtedness to, and even inescapable connexion with, what was more spurious and unprimitive in the views held by the mediaeval Church. It cannot be denied that in this case the demonstration, however startling it may seem at first sight, is truly impressive. Still, it should not be pressed too far.

First, I am afraid, Father Dix in his attempt to draw such an absolute distinction between the "baptism in water" which only brings us in touch with the Passion and Resurrection of Christ, and then the "Baptism in Spirit," only conveyed through the Unction of the Chrism provided by the bishop, remains much more dominated by, let us say, mediaeval assumptions than he fancies himself to be. I mean that, precisely because "Baptism" in the mind of the old church, as he rightly points out, embraced the whole of the ceremony, from the first preliminary exorcism to the admission to the Paschal Mass, it would be rather unhistorical to make such a sharp distinction between what is achieved through different portions of the whole rite. Just as the true solution of the controversy between East and West on the precise moment of Eucharistic consecration, whether it is at the words of the Institution, or at the Epiclesis, is that formerly nobody knew anything of any moment of that kind, but the general belief was the whole of the *prex sacerdotalis* was consecratory, thus they believed the complete process of the baptism in water and the various unctions conferred union with the Passion-Resurrection of Christ and the gift of the Spirit, *per modum unius*. Then, when the Church, tacitly or in any other way, accepted the disappearance of the bishop's immediate intervention, it was quite easy to transfer, without any alteration properly so-called, the full meaning of the rite to what it consisted of. And, in another case, when that episcopal intervention was resumed, but separated by a long interval of years from the first part of "Baptism," it was possible to see it as already potentially performed at the completion of the first ceremony. Hence while implying and postulating its τελείωσις through the second rite, the fortuitous absence of this might not prevent the former of having a full effect on the subject, at least in its essentials. It may be, there is an apparent lack of logic in such a proceeding, but the sacramental practice of the Church has never

been a matter of logic, but of "economy," in the larger sense of the word common in the ancient Church.

Of course, there is a danger here : that of depriving Confirmation as such of any proper meaning, and, by way of consequence, of undervaluing the general importance of the gift of the Spirit as such in Christian life. In the measure in which Father Dix only wants to react against that danger, we believe his thesis to be quite right. But we should be much more cautious in countenancing him in any attempt to exclude from those who have received what he would call only "baptism in water" any true gift of the Spirit.

We might add that all this discussion cannot be cleared up as long as we are not more exactly informed of what the term "gift of the Spirit" meant to the ancient Church. I am persuaded that Father Dix (as he has shown elsewhere) is perfectly aware of the difficulties of the matter, which are not at all what most people would think. But I am somewhat surprised to see in his writings on the present matter that he does not seem to be very concerned with it. On my part, I would only suggest now that, for the ancient Church, the "gift of the Spirit," the "seal of the perfect Christian," conveyed the idea of a fullness or plenitude of initiation. But this does not seem to me to be exclusive of any workings (if not of the "gift" proper and in full) of the Spirit before. If this is rightly apprehended and understood, I do not think the opposition between the mediaeval and the primitive practices and theologies to be as drastic as it is in Dom Gregory Dix's exposition of the case.

What is perhaps more important still, Father Dix's whole system does not seem to do full justice to the importance of the *consignatio* with Chrism, by a presbyter, immediately after "baptism in water," as it has always been kept by the liturgies which have admitted the separation of Baptism and Confirmation. That rite will last perhaps for ever as the beam in the eye of the critics of the mediaeval and modern practice and theology when they wish to reserve for the episcopal function alone the "gift of the Spirit." In fact, while we can agree with Father Dix in seeing in the unctions (much more than in the laying on of hands) the proper sign of the gift of the Spirit in the ancient Church, we cannot but be puzzled by the sharply drawn distinctions as to the sign in the whole mass of our documents of this period.

First, it seems, there have ever been not one but many unctions in the baptismal rite : some with one oil, and some

Meaning and Importance of Confirmation 101

with another (either *oleum catechumenarum*, or *chrisma*), some by the presbyters, and some by the bishop. And we cannot see any means, and the less so as we go farther into the past, of determining exactly what was the meaning of this and the meaning of that. In consequence, we must be very cautious before we attempt to assign to any part of the rite the function of giving the Spirit.

It follows that we find it quite impossible to be convinced by Dom Gregory Dix in his third point which we have mentioned: that is, that the gift of the Spirit in the primitive Church, as in what may be supposed to lie behind the New Testament texts, would have been conferred by an unction before the "baptism in water." All that can be said is that, as far as we can go back, we find unctions in the baptismal ceremony, sometimes after, sometimes before, baptism, or even, as in the case in the *Traditio*, one before and two after (and even perhaps more than these three). Nothing then varies more than the number of these unctions, and no exact definition can be made of their meaning. What is uncertain, can be condensed in two propositions:

(1) The "gift of the Spirit," as seen as the *τελείωσις* of the Christian initiation, finds its expression in the *whole process* of these unctions, though it may be more clearly connected with one or another;

(2) That "gift," inasmuch as it is one with the Christian "seal," appears to be more especially under the care of the bishop, and solemnly proclaimed in his personal part in the rite (but nothing appears which would prevent it from being, in one way or another, delegated by him to the presbyters).

When that has been said, the question of what is implied in the "laying on of hands" of the apostles in the Acts is no longer as difficult as it seems to be to Father Dix;—though this he never avows. I mean that, when we come to realize that the "gift of the Spirit," in the liturgical tradition, has never been so closely tied to any particular sign as Father Dix would have us believe, we are no longer interested in the attempt to prove that it was not connected in the New Testament with another rite than the unction, which appears everywhere to be linked to it in the liturgies. Too scanty and too dubious are the possible traces, in the New Testament, of an unction already connected with it, on the one hand, too uncertain the grounds for understanding the "laying on of hands" of the Apostles in the Acts as conferring anything else than the common "gift" offered to every full

Christian, on the other to make us see in it rather a prophetic ordination than the ancestor of our modern Confirmation.

It may be, these conclusions of a Roman writer will seem to be less uncompromisingly "Catholic" than those bold attempts to refashion the liturgical and theological history from a high-Church Anglican point of view. But I quietly confess, in the Roman Catholic Church, we do not feel ashamed of being (or appearing) a little "lower" than people may be anywhere else. We are reluctant, admittedly, to adopt prematurely such drastic remodellings of history as Father Dix is never afraid to perform in the most disconcerting way, to the bewilderment of more sober theologians; at times he seems so youthfully delighted to shock us. Yet we are not so far from him as to what concerns the main trend of his thesis: i.e. the paramount importance of the "gift of the Spirit" in the Christian initiation and the final inseparability of Baptism and Confirmation, whatever be the practical agency of their ministration.

L. BOUYER, *of the Oratory.*